

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXIX.—APRIL, 1904—No. 114.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER PIUS X.

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND
OTHER ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION
WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

Venerable Brethren, Health and the Apostolic Blessing:

A N interval of a few months will again bring round that most happy day on which, fifty years ago, our predecessor, Pius IX., of holy memory, surrounded by a splendid throng of Cardinals and Bishops, pronounced and promulgated with the authority of the infallible magisterium, as a truth revealed by God that the Most Blessed Virgin Mary in the first instant of her conception was free from all stain of original sin. All the world knows the feelings with which the faithful of every nation of the earth received this proclamation and the manifestations of public satisfaction and joy which greeted it; for truly there has not been in the memory of man any more universal or more harmonious expression of sentiment shown towards the august Mother of God or the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

And, Venerable Brethren, why should we not hope to-day after the lapse of half a century, when we renew the memory of the

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1903, by P. J. Ryan, in the
Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

Immaculate Virgin, that an echo of that holy joy will be awakened in our minds, and that the magnificent scenes of that distant day, of faith and of love towards the august Mother of God, will be repeated? Of all this we are, indeed, made ardently desirous by the devotion, united with supreme gratitude for favors received, which we have always cherished toward the Blessed Virgin; and we have a sure pledge of the fulfilment of our desires in the fervor of all Catholics, ready and willing as they are to multiply their testimonies of love and reverence for the great Mother of God. But we must not omit to say that this desire of ours is especially stimulated by a sort of secret instinct which prompts us to regard as not far distant the fulfilment of those great hopes, assuredly not unfounded, which the solemn promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception gave rise to in the minds of Pius, our predecessor, and of all the Bishops of the world.

Many, it is true, lament the fact that until now these hopes have been unfulfilled, and are prone to repeat the words of Jeremias: "We looked for peace and no good came; for a time of healing, and behold fear." (Jeremias viii., 15.) But all such will be certainly rebuked as "men of little faith," who make no effort to penetrate the works of God or to estimate them in the light of truth. For who can number the secret gifts of grace which God has bestowed upon His Church through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin throughout this period? And even overlooking these gifts, what is to be said of the Vatican Council so opportunely convoked; or of the dogma of Papal Infallibility promulgated in time to meet the errors that were about to arise; or, finally, of that new and unprecedented fervor with which the faithful of all classes and of every nation have long been wending their way hither to venerate in person the Vicar of Christ? Surely the Providence of God has shown itself admirably in our two predecessors, Pius and Leo, who with such great holiness ruled the Church in most turbulent times through a length of Pontificate conceded to no other before them. Then, again, no sooner had Pius IX. proclaimed as a dogma of Catholic faith the exemption of Mary from the original stain, than the Virgin herself began in Lourdes those wonderful manifestations, followed by the vast and magnificent movements which have resulted in those two temples dedicated to the Immaculate Mother, where the prodigies which still continue to take place through her intercession furnish splendid arguments against the incredulity of our days.

Witnesses, then, as we are of all these great benefits which God has granted through the benign influence of the Virgin in those fifty years now about to be completed, why should we not believe

that our salvation is nearer than we thought; all the more so since we know from experience that, in the dispensations of Divine Providence, when evils reach their limit, deliverance is not far distant? "Her time is near at hand, and her days shall not be prolonged. For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob and will choose one out of Israel." (Isaias xiv., 1.) Wherefore the hope we cherish is not a vain one, that we, too, may before long repeat: "The Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked; the rod of the rulers. The whole earth is quiet and still; it is glad and hath rejoiced." (Isaias xiv., 5, 7.)

But the first and chief reason, Venerable Brethren, why the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception should excite a singular fervor in the souls of Christians lies for us in that restoration of all things in Christ which we have already set forth in our first Encyclical letter. For can any one fail to see that there is no surer or more direct road than by Mary for uniting all mankind in Christ and obtaining through Him the perfect adoption of sons, that we may be holy and immaculate in the sight of God? For if to Mary it was truly said: "Blessed art thou who hast believed, because in thee shall be fulfilled the things that have been told thee by the Lord" (Luke i., 45); or in other words, that she would conceive and bring forth the Son of God; and if she did receive in her womb Him who is by nature Truth itself in order that "He, generated in a new order, and with a new nativity, though invisible in Himself, might become visible in our flesh:"¹ the Son of God made man, being the "author and finisher of faith," it surely follows that His Mother most holy should be recognized as participating in the divine mysteries and as being in a manner the guardian of them, and that upon her as upon a foundation, the noblest after Christ, rises the edifice of the faith of all centuries.

How think otherwise? God could have given us the Redeemer of the human race, and the Founder of the Faith, in another way than through the Virgin, but since Divine Providence has been pleased that we should have the Man-God through Mary, who conceived Him by the Holy Ghost and bore Him in her womb, it only remains for us to receive Christ from the hands of Mary. Hence wherever the Scriptures *prophesy of the grace which was to come in us* the Redeemer of mankind is almost invariably presented to us as united with His Mother. The Lamb that is to rule the world will be sent—but He will be sent from the rock of the desert; the flower will blossom, but it will blossom from the root of Jesse. Adam, the father of mankind, looked to Mary crushing the serpent's head,

¹ St. Leo the Great, Ser. 2, De Nativ. Dom.

and he restrained the tears which the malediction brought into his eyes; Noë thought of her when shut up in the ark of safety, and Abraham when prevented from the slaying of his son; Jacob at the sight of the ladder on which angels ascended and descended; Moses amazed at the sight of the bush which burned but was not consumed; David escorting the ark of God with dancing and psalmody; Elias as he looked at the little cloud that rose out of the sea. In fine, after Christ, we find in Mary the end of the law and the fulfilment of the figures and oracles.

And it cannot be doubted that through the Virgin, and through her more than through any other means, we have a way of reaching the knowledge of Jesus Christ offered to us when it is remembered that with her alone of all others Jesus for thirty years was united, as it behooves a son to be united with his mother, in the closest ties of intimacy and domestic life. Who more than His Mother could have a far-reaching knowledge of the admirable mysteries of the birth and childhood of Christ, and above all of the mystery of the Incarnation, which is the beginning and the foundation of faith? She not only *kept in her heart* the events of Bethlehem and what took place in Jerusalem in the Temple of the Lord, but sharing as she did the thoughts and the secret wishes of Christ she may be said to have lived the very life of her Son. Hence nobody ever knew Christ so profoundly as she did, and nobody can ever be more competent as a guide and teacher of the knowledge of Christ.

Hence it follows, as we have already pointed out, that the Virgin is more powerful than all others as a means of uniting mankind with Christ. Hence, too, since, according to Christ Himself "Now this is eternal life: That they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (John xvii., 3), and since it is through Mary that we attain to the knowledge of Christ, through Mary also we most easily obtain that life of which Christ is the source and origin.

And if we consider ever so little how many and powerful are the reasons which prompt this most holy Mother to bestow on us these precious gifts, oh, how our hopes will be expanded!

For is not Mary the Mother of Christ? Then she is our Mother also. And we must in truth hold that Christ, the Word made Flesh, is also the Saviour of mankind. He had a material body like that of any other man; and as Saviour of the human family, he had a spiritual and mystical body, the society, namely, of those who believe in Christ. "We are many, but one sole body in Christ." (Rom. xii., 5.) Now the Blessed Virgin did not conceive the Eternal Son of God merely in order that He might be made man, taking His human nature from her, but also in order that by means of the

nature assumed from her He might be the Redeemer of men. For which reason the Angel said to the Shepherds: "To-day there is born to you a Saviour who is Christ the Lord." (Luke ii., 11.) Wherefore in the same holy bosom of His most chaste Mother, Christ took to Himself flesh, and united to Himself the spiritual body formed by those who were to believe in Him. Hence Mary, carrying the Saviour within her, may be said to have also carried all those whose life was contained in the life of the Saviour. Therefore all we who are united to Christ, and as the Apostle says, are "members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones" (Ephesians v., 30) have issued from the womb of Mary like a body united to its head. Hence then in a spiritual and mystical fashion, we are all children of Mary, and she is Mother of us all; "the Mother, spiritually indeed, but truly the Mother of the members of Christ, who we are."²

If, then, the most Blessed Virgin is the Mother at once of God and men, who can doubt that she will endeavor with all diligence to procure that Christ, "the Head of the Body of the Church" (Colossians i., 18), may transfuse His gifts into us, His members, and above all know Him and "live by Him?" (I. John iv., 9.)

Moreover, it was not only the glory of the Mother of God "to have presented to God the Only Begotten who was to be born of human members"³ the material by which He was prepared as a Victim for the salvation of mankind, but hers also the office of tending and nourishing that Victim and at the appointed time of offering Him at the altar. Hence that never dissociated manner of life and labors of the Son and the Mother which permits the application to both of the words of the Psalmist: "My life is consumed in sorrow and my years in groans." (Psalm xxx., 11.) When the supreme hour of the Son came, beside the Cross of Jesus there stood Mary His Mother not merely occupied in contemplating the cruel spectacle, but rejoicing that her Only Son was offered for the salvation of mankind; and so entirely participating in His Passion that, if it had been possible, "she would have gladly borne all the torments that her Son underwent."⁴ From this community of will and suffering between Christ and Mary "she merited to become most worthily the Reparatrix of the lost world"⁵ and Dispensatrix of all the gifts that Our Saviour purchased for us by His Death and by His Blood.

It cannot, of course, be denied that the dispensing of these treasures is the particular and peculiar right of Jesus Christ, for they

² S. Augustine L. de S. Virginitate, c. 6.

³ S. Bede Ven. L. iv. in Luc. xl.

⁴ S. Bonaventure I. Sent. d. 48, ad Litt, dub. 4.

⁵ Eadmeri Mon. De Excellentia Virg. Mariae, c. 9.

are the exclusive fruit of His Death, who by His nature is the mediator between God and man. Nevertheless, by this union in sorrow and suffering, as we have said, which existed between the Mother and the Son, it has been allowed to the august Virgin "to be the most powerful mediatrix and advocate of the whole world with her Divine Son."⁶ The source, then, is Jesus Christ, "of whose fulness we have all received" (John i., 16), "from whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly joined together by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in charity." (Ephesians iv., 16.) But Mary, as St. Bernard justly remarks, is the *channel*,⁷ or, if you will, that connecting portion by which the body is joined to the head and by which the head exerts its power and its virtue: "For she is the neck of our Head by which He communicates to His Mystical body all spiritual gifts."⁸

We are thus, it will be seen, very far from declaring the Mother of God to be the author of supernatural grace which belongs to God alone; but since she surpassed all in holiness and union with Christ, and has been associated by Christ in the work of redemption, she, as the expression is, merits *de congruo* what Christ merits *de condigno*, and is the principal minister in the distribution of grace. "He sitteth at the right hand of the Majesty on high" (Hebrews i., 3); but Mary sitteth as a Queen on His right hand, the securest refuge of those who are in peril, as well as the most faithful of helpers, so that we have naught to fear, or despair of as long as "she is our guide and our patroness; while she is propitious and protects."⁹

With these principles laid down and returning to our subject, will it not appear to all that it is right and proper to affirm that Mary whom Jesus made His assiduous companion from the house of Nazareth to the *place of Calvary* knew as none other knew the secrets of His Heart; distributes as by a mother's right the treasures of His merits; and is the surest help to the knowledge and love of Christ? They prove it only too truly who by their deplorable manner of life deceived by false teaching or the wiles of the devil fancy they can dispense with the aid of the Virgin Mother. Miserable and unhappy are they who neglect her on the pretence that thus they honor Christ. They forget that *the child is not found without Mary His Mother*.

Under these circumstances, Venerable Brethren, such is the end which all the solemnities that are everywhere being prepared in

⁶ Pius IX., "Ineffabilis."

⁷ Serm. de temp on the Nativ. B. V. De Aquæductu, n. 4.

⁸ St. Bernardin. Sen. Quadrag. de Evangel. ætern. Serm. X.

⁹ Pius IX., Bulla "Ineffabilis."

honor of the holy and Immaculate Conception of Mary should have in view. No homage is more agreeable to her, none is sweeter to her than that we should know and really love Jesus Christ. Let, then, crowds fill the churches—let solemn feasts be celebrated and public rejoicings be made. Such manifestations are eminently suited for enlivening our faith. But unless heart and will be added, they will all be empty forms; mere appearances of piety. At such a spectacle, the Virgin, borrowing the words of Jesus Christ, would address us with the just reproach: "This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me." (Matthew xv., 8.)

For to be genuine our piety towards the Mother of God ought to spring from the heart; external acts have neither utility nor value if the acts of the soul have no part in them. Now these latter can only have one object, which is that we should fully carry out what the divine Son of Mary commands. For if true love alone has the power to unite the wills of men, it is of prime necessity that we should have one will with Mary to serve Jesus our Lord. What this most prudent Virgin said to the servants at the marriage feast of Cana she addresses also to us: "Whatsoever He shall say to you, do ye." (John ii., 5.) Now here is the word of Jesus Christ: "If you would enter into life, keep the commandments." (Matthew xix., 17.) Let then each one fully convince himself of this, that if his piety towards the Blessed Virgin does not hinder him from sinning, or does not move his will to amend an evil life, it is a deceptive and lying piety, wanting as it is in proper effect and in its natural fruit.

If any one desires a confirmation of this it may easily be found in the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary. For leaving aside tradition which, as well as Scripture, is a source of truth, whence has this conviction of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin shown itself in every age to be so much in keeping with the Christian instinct as to appear fixed and innate in the hearts of the faithful? We shrink with horror from saying, as Denis the Carthusian so well expresses it, that "this woman who was to crush the head of the serpent should have been crushed by him and that the Mother of God should have ever been a daughter of the Evil One."¹⁰ No, to the Christian intelligence the idea is unthinkable that the flesh of Christ, holy, stainless, innocent, was formed in the womb of Mary of a flesh which had ever, if only for the briefest moment, contracted any stain. And why so, but because an infinite opposition separates God from sin? There certainly we have the origin of the conviction common to all Christians that before Jesus Christ, clothed in human nature, cleansed us from our sins in His

¹⁰ Sent. d. 3, q. 1.

blood, He accorded Mary the grace and special privilege of being preserved and exempted, from the first moment of her conception, from all stain of original sin.

If, then, God has such a horror of sin as to have willed to keep the future Mother of His Son not only free from the stains which are voluntarily contracted; but, by a special favor and in prevision of the merits of Jesus Christ, from that other stain of which the sad sign is transmitted to all the children of Adam by a sort of hapless heritage, who can doubt that it is a duty for every one who desires to deserve well of Mary by his homage to correct his vicious and depraved habits and subdue the passions which incite him to evil?

Whoever, moreover, wishes, and no one ought not so to wish, that his devotion should be perfect and worthy of her, should go further and strive might and main to imitate her example. It is a divine law that those only attain everlasting happiness who have by such faithful following reproduced in themselves the form of the patience and sanctity of Jesus Christ: "for whom He foreknew, He also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of His Son; that He might be the first-born amongst many brethren." (Romans viii., 29.) But such generally is our infirmity that we are easily discouraged by the greatness of such an example. By the providence of God, however, another example is proposed to us, which is both as near to Christ as human nature allows, and more nearly accords with the weakness of our nature. And this is no other than that of the Mother of God. "Such was Mary," very pertinently points out St. Ambrose, "that her life is an example for all." And, therefore, he rightly concludes: "Have then before your eyes, as an image, the virginity and life of Mary from whom as from a mirror shines forth the brightness of chastity and the form of virtue."¹¹

Now if it becomes children not to omit the imitation of any of the virtues of this most Blessed Mother, we yet wish that the faithful apply themselves by preference to the principal virtues which are, as it were, the nerves and joints of the Christian life—we mean faith, hope and charity towards God and our neighbor. Although no part of the life of Mary fails to show the brilliant character of these virtues, yet they attained their highest degree of splendor at the time when she stood by her dying Son. Jesus is nailed to the cross, and He is reproached with maledictions for having "made Himself the Son of God." (John xix., 7.) But she unceasingly recognized and adored the divinity in Him. She bore His dead body to the tomb, but never for a moment doubted that He would rise again. Then the love of God with which she burned made

¹¹ De Virginit. L. ii., c. ii.

her a partaker in the sufferings of Christ and the associate in His passion; with Him, moreover, as if forgetful of her own sorrow, she prayed for the pardon of the executioners, although they in their hate cried out: "His blood be upon us and upon our children." (Matthew xxvii., 25.)

But lest it be thought that we have lost sight of our subject, which is the Immaculate Conception, what great and opportune help will be found in it for the preservation and right development of those same virtues! What in fact is the starting point of the enemies of religion in spreading the great and grievous errors by which the faith of so many is shaken? They begin by denying that man has fallen by sin and has been cast down from his primal state. Hence they regard as mere fables original sin and the evils that were its consequence. Humanity, vitiated in its source, vitiated in its turn the whole race of man; and thus was evil introduced amongst men and the necessity for a Redeemer involved. Rejecting all this it is easy to understand that no place is left for Christ, for the Church, for grace or for anything that is above and beyond nature; in a word the whole edifice of faith is shaken from top to bottom. But let the people believe and confess that the Virgin Mary has been from the first moment of her conception preserved from all stain; and it is straightway necessary to admit both original sin and the rehabilitation of the human race by Jesus Christ, the Gospel and the Church and the law of suffering. Thus Rationalism and Materialism will be torn up by the roots and destroyed, and there will be given to the teaching of Christianity the glory of guarding and protecting the truth. It is, moreover, a vice common to the enemies of the faith of our time especially, that they repudiate and proclaim the necessity of repudiating all respect and obedience for the authority of the Church, and even of any human power, in the idea that it will thus be more easy to make an end of faith. Here we have the origin of anarchism, than which nothing is more pernicious and destructive to both the natural and supernatural order. Now this evil, which is equally fatal to society at large and to Christianity, is done away with by the dogma of the Immaculate Conception by the obligation which it imposes of recognizing in the Church a power before which not only the will but the intelligence has to subject itself. It is because of such subjection of the reason that Christians sing the praise of the Mother of God: "Thou art all fair, O Mary, and the stain of original sin is not in thee."¹² And thus once again is justified what the Church attributes to this august Virgin that she has exterminated all heresies in the world.

¹² Mass of Immac. Concep.

And if, as the Apostle declares, "faith is nothing else than the substance of things to be hoped for" (Hebrews xi., 1) every one will easily grant that our faith is confirmed and our hope aroused and strengthened by the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin. The Virgin was kept the more free from all stain of original sin because she was to be the Mother of Christ, and she was the Mother of Christ that the hope of everlasting happiness might be born again in our souls.

Leaving aside charity towards God, who can contemplate the Immaculate Virgin without feeling moved to fulfil that precept which Christ called peculiarly His own, namely, that of loving one another as He loved us? "A great sign," thus the Apostle St. John describes a vision divinely sent him that appeared in the heavens: "A woman clothed with the sun, and with the moon under her feet and a crown of twelve stars upon her head." (Apocalypse xii., 1.) Every one knows that this woman signified the Virgin Mary, the stainless one who brought forth our Head. The Apostle continues: "And, being with child, she cried travailing in birth, and was in pain to be delivered." (Apocalypse xii., 2.) John therefore saw the Most Holy Mother of God already in eternal happiness, yet travailing in a mysterious childbirth. What birth was it? Surely it was the birth of us who, still in exile, are yet to be generated to the perfect charity of God, and to eternal happiness. And the birth pains show the love and desire with which the Virgin from heaven above watches over us, and strives with unwearying prayer to bring about the completion of the number of the elect.

This same charity we desire that all should earnestly endeavor to attain, taking advantage of the extraordinary feasts in honor of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. Oh how bitterly and fiercely is Jesus Christ now being persecuted, as well as the most holy religion which He founded! And how grave is the peril that threatens many of being drawn away to abandon the faith by the errors that are spread broadcast! "Then let him who thinks he stands take heed lest he fall." (I. Corinthians x., 12.) And let all, with humble prayer and entreaty, implore of God, through the intercession of Mary, that those who have abandoned the truth may repent. We know, indeed, from experience that such prayer, born of charity and trust in the Virgin, has never been vain. True, even in the future the strife against the Church will never cease, "for there must be also heresies, that they also who are reprov'd may be made manifest among you." (I. Corinthians xi., 19.) But neither will the Virgin ever cease to succor us in our trials, however grave they be, and to carry on the fight fought by

her since her conception, so that every day we may repeat: "To-day the head of the serpent of old was crushed by her."¹³

In order that heavenly graces may help us more abundantly than usual during this year to honor and to imitate the Blessed Virgin, and that thus we may more easily secure our object of restoring all things in Christ, we have determined, after the example of our predecessors at the beginning of their Pontificates, to grant to the Catholic world an extraordinary indulgence in the form of a jubilee.

Wherefore, confiding in the mercy of Almighty God and in the authority of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, by virtue of that power of binding and loosing which, unworthy though we are, the Lord has given us, we do concede and impart the most plenary indulgence of all their sins to the faithful, all and several of both sexes, dwelling in this our beloved city, or coming into it, who from the first Sunday in Lent, that is from the 21st of February, to the second day of June, the solemnity of the Most Sacred Body of Christ inclusively, shall three times visit one of the four Patriarchal basilicas, and there for some time pray God for the liberty and exaltation of the Catholic Church and this Apostolic See, for the extirpation of the heresies and the conversion of all who are in error, for the concord of Christian Princes and the peace and unity of all the faithful, and according to our intention; and who, within the said period, shall fast once, using only meagre fare, excepting the days not included in the Lenten Indult; and, after confessing their sins, shall receive the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist; and to all others, wherever they be, dwelling outside this city, who, within the time above mentioned or during a space of three months, even not continuous, to be definitely appointed by the ordinaries according to the convenience of the faithful, but before the eighth day of December, shall three times visit the cathedral church, if there be one, or, if not, the parish church; or, in the absence of this, the principal church; and shall devoutly fulfil the other works above mentioned. And we do at the same time permit that this indulgence, which is to be gained only once, may be applied in suffrage for the souls which have passed from this life united in charity with God.

We do, moreover, concede that travelers by land or sea may gain the same indulgence immediately on their return to their homes provided they perform the works already indicated.

To confessors approved by their respective ordinaries we grant faculties for commuting the above works enjoined by us for other works of piety, and this concession shall be applicable not only to regulars of both sexes, but to all others who cannot perform the

¹³ Office Immac. Con., II. Vespers, Magnif.

works prescribed, and we do grant faculties also to dispense from Communion children who have not yet been admitted to it.

Moreover, to the faithful, all and several, the laity and the clergy both secular and regular of all orders and institutes, even those calling for special mention, we do grant permission and power, for this sole object, to select any priest, regular or secular, among those actually approved (which faculty may also be used by nuns, novices and other women living in the cloister, provided the confessor they select be one approved for nuns) by whom, when they have confessed to him within the prescribed time with the intention of gaining the present jubilee and of fulfilling all the other works requisite for gaining it, they may on this sole occasion and only in the forum of conscience be absolved from all excommunication, suspension and every other ecclesiastical sentence and censure pronounced or inflicted for any cause by the law or by a judge, including those reserved to the ordinary and to us or to the Apostolic See, even in cases reserved in a special manner to anybody whomsoever and to us and to the Apostolic See; and they may also be absolved from all sin or transgression, even those reserved to the ordinaries themselves and to us and the Apostolic See, on condition, however, that a salutary penance be enjoined together with the other prescriptions of the law, and in the case of heresy after the abjuration and retraction of error as is enjoined by the law; and the said priests may further commute to other pious and salutary works all vows even those taken under oath and reserved to the Apostolic See (except those of chastity, of religion and of obligations which have been accepted by third persons); and with the said penitents, even regulars, in sacred orders such confessors may dispense from all secret irregularities contracted solely by violation of censures affecting the exercise of said orders and promotion to higher orders.

But we do not intend by the present Letters to dispense from any irregularities whatsoever, or from crime or defect, public or private, contracted in any manner through notoriety or other incapacity or inability; nor do we intend to derogate from the Constitution with its accompanying declaration, published by Benedict XIV. of happy memory, which begins with the words *Sacramentum poenitentiae*; nor is it our intention that these present Letters may, or can, in any way avail those who, by us and the Apostolic See, or by any ecclesiastical judge, have been by name excommunicated, suspended, interdicted or declared under other sentences or censures, or who have been publicly denounced, unless they do within the allotted time satisfy, or, when necessary, come to an arrangement with the parties concerned.

To all this we are pleased to add that we do concede and will

that all retain during this time of jubilee the privilege of gaining all other indulgences, not excepting plenary indulgences, which have been granted by our predecessors or by ourself.

We close these Letters, Venerable Brethren, by manifesting anew the great hope we earnestly cherish that through this extraordinary gift of jubilee granted by us under the auspices of the Immaculate Virgin, large numbers of those who are unhappily separated from Jesus Christ may return to Him, and that love of virtue and fervor of devotion may flourish anew among the Christian people. Fifty years ago, when Pius IX. proclaimed as an article of faith the Immaculate Conception of the most Blessed Mother of Christ, it seemed, as we have already said, as if an incredible wealth of grace were poured out upon the earth; and with the increase of confidence in the Virgin Mother of God, the old religious spirit of the people was everywhere greatly augmented. Is it forbidden us to hope for still greater things for the future? True, we are passing through disastrous times, when we may well make our own the lamentation of the Prophet: "There is no truth and no mercy and no knowledge of God on the earth. Blasphemy and lying and homicide and theft and adultery have inundated it." (Osee iv., 1-2.) Yet in the midst of this deluge of evil, the Virgin Most Clement rises before our eyes like a rainbow, as the arbiter of peace between God and man: "I will set my bow in the clouds and it shall be the sign of a covenant between me and between the earth." (Genesis ix., 13.) Let the storm rage and sky darken—not for that shall we be dismayed. "And the bow shall be in the clouds, and I shall see it and shall remember the everlasting covenant." (Genesis ix., 16.) "And there shall no more be waters of a flood to destroy all flesh." (Genesis ix., 15.) Oh, yes, if we trust as we should in Mary, now especially when we are about to celebrate, with more than usual fervor, her Immaculate Conception, we shall recognize in her the Virgin most powerful "who with virginal foot did crush the head of the serpent."¹⁴

In pledge of these graces, Venerable Brethren, we impart the Apostolic Benediction lovingly in the Lord to you and to your people.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the second day of February, 1904, in the first year of our Pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

¹⁴ Offl. Immac. Conc.

PAPAL LETTER TO HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL RES-
PIGHI, VICAR GENERAL OF ROME, REGARDING
THE REGULATIONS FOR THE RESTORA-
TION OF SACRED MUSIC.

My Lord Cardinal:

THE earnest wish to see the decorum, dignity and sanctity of the liturgical functions fully restored has determined us to make known by means of a special communication from our own hand what our desire is with regard to the sacred music so largely used in connection with worship. We are confident that all will help us in this desired restoration not merely with implicit obedience, praiseworthy as that, too, always is, for through it commands that are onerous and contrary to our own way of thinking and feeling are accepted in a pure spirit of obedience, but also with that alacrity of will which springs from the intimate conviction that the action enjoined is necessary for reasons duly understood, clear, evident, irresistible.

From a little reflection on the sacred object for which art is admitted to the service of worship, and on the imperative propriety of offering to the Lord only things good in themselves and, where possible, excellent, it will be readily recognized that the prescriptions of the Church with respect to sacred music are only the direct application of those two fundamental principles. When the clergy and choirmasters are penetrated by them good sacred music revives thoroughly and spontaneously, as has been witnessed and is continually observed in a great number of places; when, on the other hand, those principles are lost sight of, neither prayers nor admonitions, nor severe and repeated commands, nor threats of canonical penalties suffice to prevent change; to such an extent does passion, and if not that, a shameful and inexcusable ignorance, find means to elude the wish of the Church and to remain for years in the same reprehensible state of affairs.

Such alacrity of will we expect in a particular manner from the clergy and the faithful of this our beloved city of Rome, the centre of Christianity and the seat of the supreme authority of the Church. It seems in truth that no one ought to be more sensible to the influence of our word than those who hear it directly from our mouth, and that none ought to show greater solicitude in offering the example of loving and filial submission to our paternal invitations than the first and most noble portion of the flock of Christ, namely, the Church of Rome, specially committed to our pastoral care as Bishop. Moreover, this example ought to be given in sight of the whole

world. From every quarter both Bishops and the faithful come here continually to pay honor to the Vicar of Christ and to retemper the spirit in visiting our venerable basilicas and the tombs of the martyrs, and in being present with redoubled fervor at the solemn functions celebrated here at every time of the year with all pomp and splendor. "Optamus ne moribus nostris offensi recedant," said our predecessor Benedict XIV. in his day, in his encyclical letter, "Annus qui," speaking of sacred music: "We desire that they should not return to their country scandalized by our customs." And touching further upon the abuse of instruments then prevalent, the same Pontiff said: "What idea will they form of us who, coming from countries where instruments are not used in church, will hear them in our churches in exactly the same way as people are accustomed to do at the theatres and other profane places? They will come also from places and countries where there is singing and instrumental music in the churches as now in ours. But if they are people of sense they will be pained at not finding in our music that remedy for the evils in their churches which they came here to seek." In other times perhaps but little notice was taken of the departure of the music executed in our churches from the ecclesiastical laws and prescriptions, and the scandal was perchance more limited, inasmuch as what was unbecoming was more widely practiced and more general. But now, since so much zeal is expended by men of merit in explaining the meaning of the liturgy and of the arts used in connection with worship, since in so many churches throughout the world there have been obtained in the restoration of sacred music such consoling and not rarely such splendid results, the gravest difficulties being happily overcome, since, in fine, the necessity of an absolute change in the state of things is universally felt, every abuse in this department becomes intolerable and should be removed.

You will, then, my Lord Cardinal, we are sure, in your high office as our Vicar in Rome for spiritual affairs, with the gentleness which belongs to your character, but not with the less firmness, see that the music executed in the churches and chapels both of the secular and the regular clergy of this city comply fully with our instructions. Many things ought to be removed or corrected in the singing of the Masses, of the Litany of Loretto and of the Eucharistic hymn; but a complete renovation is needed in the singing of Vespers on the festivals celebrated in the various churches and basilicas. In it the liturgical directions of the "*Ceremoniale Episcoporum*" and the fine musical traditions of the classical Roman school are no longer met with. For the devout psalm singing of the clergy, in which the people joined, have been substituted interminable musical composi-

tions on the words of the Psalms, all figured after the manner of old theatrical operas and for the most part so wretched from the point of view of art that they would never be tolerated even at unimportant secular concerts. Devotion and Christian piety are certainly not promoted by them. They feed the curiosity of some persons of slight intelligence, but the majority of people are only disgusted and scandalized, and wonder that so great an abuse still continues. We therefore desire an entire change and that the service of Vespers be celebrated altogether in accordance with the liturgical rules indicated by us. In setting the example precedence will be taken by the patriarchal basilicas through the earnest care and enlightened zeal of the Cardinals to whose charge they have been assigned, and the minor basilicas and the collegiate and parochial churches will vie with these as well as the churches and chapels of the religious orders. And you, my Lord Cardinal, will grant no indulgence, will allow no delays. The difficulty would not be diminished, but rather increased, by postponement, and since the plunge is to be made, let it be made at once and resolutely. Let all have confidence in us and in our word, with which is associated the grace and blessing of heaven. At first the novelty of the change will produce astonishment in the breasts of some; perhaps some of the choirmasters and directors will be found rather unprepared; but gradually the matter will amend itself, and in the perfect correspondence of the music with the liturgical rules and with the nature of psalmody all will observe a beauty and excellence perhaps never before noticed. Indeed, the service of Vespers will thus be shortened in a notable degree. But if the rectors of the churches wish under any circumstances to prolong the functions somewhat in order to afford mental enjoyment to the people who in such a praiseworthy manner come at Vesper time to the church in which the service is held, it will not be unbefitting—indeed, it will be so much gained in the interest of piety and for the edification of the faithful—if Vespers be succeeded by an appropriate sermon and if the service concludes with Solemn Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

Finally, we desire that sacred music be cultivated with special care and within due limits in all the seminaries and ecclesiastical colleges of Rome, in which such a large and chosen body of young clerics from all parts of the world are being educated in the sacred sciences and in the true ecclesiastical spirit. We know—and this greatly comforts us—that in several institutions sacred music so flourishes that they may serve others as models. But some seminaries and colleges, either through the indifference of the superiors or the small capacity and want of taste of the persons to whom training in singing and the direction of sacred music are entrusted leave much to

be desired. You, my Lord Cardinal, will carefully see to this also, insisting above all that the Gregorian chant, according to the prescriptions of the Council of Trent and of innumerable other Councils, provincial and diocesan, in all parts of the world be studied with special diligence and be usually preferred at the public and private functions of the institution. In other times, it is true, the Gregorian chant was known to most persons only through books that were incorrect, vitiated and curtailed. But the accurate and prolonged study given to it by distinguished men who have rendered great service to sacred art has changed the face of things. The Gregorian chant restored in such a satisfactory manner to its early purity, as it was handed down by the Fathers and is found in the codices of the various churches seems soft, sweet, easy to learn and of a beauty so fresh and surprising that wherever it has been introduced it has quickly excited real enthusiasm in the youthful singers. Now, when delight enters into the fulfilment of duty, everything is done with greater alacrity and with more lasting fruit. We desire, then, that in all the colleges and seminaries in this fair city there be introduced once more the ancient Roman chant which formerly resounded in our churches and basilicas and which constitute the delight of past generations in the most glorious days of Christian piety. And as in past times that chant was spread abroad in the other churches of the West from the Church of Rome, so we desire that the young clerics trained under our eyes may take it with them and spread it again in their dioceses when they return thither as priests to work for the glory of God. It is a pleasure to us to give these regulations when we are about to celebrate the thirteenth centenary of the death of the glorious and incomparable Pontiff St. Gregory the Great, to whom an ecclesiastical tradition of many centuries has attributed the composition of the sacred melodies and from whom they have derived their name. Let our beloved youth diligently exercise themselves in them; for it will be pleasant for us to hear them when, as we have been informed, they will assemble at the coming centenary celebration at the tomb of the holy Pontiff in the Vatican Basilica to execute the Gregorian melodies during the sacred liturgy which, please God, will be celebrated on that auspicious occasion.

Meanwhile, as a pledge of our special good will, receive, my Lord Cardinal, the Apostolic Benediction, which from the bottom of our heart we impart to you, to the clergy and to all our beloved people.

From the Vatican, on the feast of the Immaculate Conception, 1903.

TEXT OF THE "MOTU PROPRIO."

Chief amongst the anxieties of the pastoral office, not only of this Supreme Chair, which we, although unworthy, occupy through the inscrutable disposition of Providence, but of every local church, is without doubt that of maintaining and promoting the decorum of the house of God where the august mysteries of religion are celebrated, and where the Christian people assemble to receive the grace of the sacraments, to be present at the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar, to adore the august Sacrament of the Lord's Body and to join in the common prayer of the Church in the public and solemn liturgical offices. Nothing then should take place in the temple calculated to disturb or even merely to diminish the piety and devotion of the faithful, nothing that may give reasonable cause for disgust or scandal, nothing, above all, which directly offends the decorum and the sanctity of the sacred functions and is thus unworthy of the house of prayer and of the majesty of God.

We do not deal separately with the abuses which may occur in this matter. To-day our attention is directed to one of the most common of them, one of the most difficult to eradicate and the existence of which is sometimes to be deplored even where everything else is deserving of the highest praise—the beauty and sumptuousness of the temple, the splendor and the accurate order of the ceremonies, the attendance of the clergy, the gravity and piety of the officiating ministers. Such is the abuse in connection with sacred chant and music. And, indeed, whether it is owing to the nature of this art, fluctuating and variable as it is in itself, or to the successive changes in tastes and habits in the course of time, or to the sad influence exercised on sacred art by profane and theatrical art, or to the pleasure that music directly produces, and that is not always easily kept within the proper limits, or finally to the many prejudices on the matter, so lightly introduced and so tenaciously maintained even among responsible and pious persons, there is a continual tendency to deviate from the right rule, fixed by the end for which art is admitted to the service of worship and laid down very clearly in the ecclesiastical canons, in the ordinances of the general and provincial councils, in the prescriptions which have on various occasions emanated from the Sacred Roman Congregations, and from our predecessors, the Sovereign Pontiffs.

It is pleasing to us to be able to acknowledge with real satisfaction the large amount of good that has been done in this respect during the last decades in this our fair city of Rome, and in many churches in our country, but in a more especial way among some nations in which excellent men, full of zeal for the worship of God,

have, with the approval of this Holy See and under the direction of the Bishops, united in flourishing societies and restored sacred music to the fullest honor in nearly all their churches and chapels. Still the good work that has been done is very far indeed from being common to all, and when we consult our own personal experience and take into account the great number of complaints that have reached us from all quarters during the short time that has elapsed since it pleased the Lord to elevate our humble person to the summit of the Roman Pontificate, we consider it our first duty, without further delay, to raise our voice at once in reproof and condemnation of all that is out of harmony with the right rule above indicated, in the functions of worship and in the performance of the ecclesiastical offices. It being our ardent desire to see the true Christian spirit restored in every respect and be preserved by all the faithful, we deem it necessary to provide before everything else for the sanctity and dignity of the temple, in which the faithful assemble for the object of acquiring this spirit from its foremost and indispensable fount, which is the active participation in the holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church. And it is vain to hope that the blessing of heaven will descend abundantly upon us for this purpose when our homage to the Most High, instead of ascending in the odor of sweetness, puts into the hand of the Lord the scourges with which the Divine Redeemer once drove the unworthy profaners from the temple.

Wherefore, in order that no one in the future may be able to plead in excuse that he did not clearly understand his duty, and that all vagueness may be removed from the interpretation of some things which have already been commanded, we have deemed it expedient to point out briefly the principles regulating sacred music in the functions of public worship, and to gather together in a general survey the principal prescriptions of the Church against the more common abuses in this matter. We therefore publish, "*motu proprio*" and with sure knowledge, our present "*Instruction*" to which, as "*to a juridical code of sacred music,*" we desire with the fulness of our Apostolic authority that the force of law be given, and we impose its scrupulous observance on all by this document in our own handwriting.

INSTRUCTION ON SACRED MUSIC.

I.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

1. Sacred music, as an integral part of the solemn liturgy, partici-

pates in its general object, which is the glory of God and the sanctification and edification of the faithful. It tends to increase the decorum and the splendor of the ecclesiastical ceremonies, and since its principal office is to clothe with befitting melody the liturgical text proposed for the understanding of the faithful its proper end is to add greater efficacy to the text, in order that by means of it the faithful may be the more easily moved to devotion and better disposed to receive the fruits of grace associated with the celebration of the most holy mysteries.

2. Sacred music should consequently possess, in the highest degree, the qualities proper to the liturgy, and precisely sanctity and goodness of form, from which spontaneously springs its other character, universality.

It must be holy, and must, accordingly, exclude all profanity not only in itself, but in the manner in which it is presented by those who execute it.

It must be true art, for otherwise it will be impossible for it to exercise on the minds of those who hear it that efficacy which the Church aims at obtaining in admitting into her liturgy the art of musical sounds.

But it must, at the same time, be universal in this sense, that while every nation is permitted to admit into its ecclesiastical compositions those special forms which in a certain manner constitute the specific character of its native music, still these forms must be subordinated in such a manner to the general characteristics of sacred music that nobody of another nation may receive, on hearing them, an impression other than good.

II.

THE KINDS OF SACRED MUSIC.

3. These qualities are possessed in the highest degree by the Gregorian Chant, which is, consequently, the Chant proper to the Roman Church, the only Chant she has inherited from the ancient fathers, which she has jealously guarded for centuries in her liturgical codices, which she directly proposes to the faithful as her own, which she prescribes exclusively for some parts of the liturgy, and which the most recent studies have so happily restored to their integrity and purity.

Upon these grounds the Gregorian Chant has always been regarded as the supreme model for sacred music, so that the following rule may be safely laid down: The more closely a composition for church approaches in its movement, inspiration and savor the Gregorian form, the more sacred and liturgical it is; and the more

out of harmony it is with that supreme model, the less worthy is it of the temple.

The ancient traditional Gregorian Chant must, therefore, be largely restored in the functions of public worship, and everybody must take for certain that an ecclesiastical function loses nothing of its solemnity when it is accompanied by no other music except this.

Efforts must especially be made to restore the use of the Gregorian Chant by the people, so that the faithful may again take a more active part in the ecclesiastical offices, as they were wont to do in ancient times.

4. The qualities mentioned are also possessed in an excellent degree by the classic polyphony, especially of the Roman school, which reached its greatest perfection in the fifteenth century, owing to the works of Pierluigi da Palestrina, and continued subsequently to produce compositions of excellent quality from the liturgical and musical standpoint. The classic polyphony approaches pretty closely to the Gregorian Chant, the supreme model of all sacred music, and hence it has been found worthy of a place side by side with the Gregorian Chant in the more solemn functions of the Church, such as those of the Pontifical Chapel. This, too, must therefore be restored largely in ecclesiastical functions, especially in the more important basilicas, in cathedrals and in the churches and chapels of seminaries and other ecclesiastical institutions in which the necessary means are usually not lacking.

5. The Church has always recognized and favored the progress of the arts, admitting to the service of worship everything good and beautiful discovered by genius in the course of ages—always, however, with due regard to the liturgical laws. Consequently modern music is also admitted in the Church, since it, too, furnishes compositions of such excellence, sobriety and gravity that they are in no way unworthy of the liturgical functions.

But as modern music has come to be devoted mainly to profane uses, greater care must be taken with regard to it, in order that the musical compositions of modern style which are admitted in the Church may contain nothing profane, be free from reminiscences of motifs adopted in the theatres and be not fashioned even in their external forms after the manner of profane pieces.

6. Amongst the various kinds of modern music that which appears less suitable for accompanying the functions of public worship is the theatrical style, which was in the greatest vogue, especially in Italy, during the last century. This of its very nature is diametrically opposed to the Gregorian Chant and the classic polyphony, and therefore to the most important law of all good music.

Besides the intrinsic structure, the rhythm and what is known as the "conventionalism" of this style adapt themselves but badly to the exigencies of true liturgical music.

III.

THE LITURGICAL TEXT.

7. The language of the Roman Church is Latin. It is therefore forbidden to sing anything whatever in the vernacular in solemn liturgical functions—much more to sing in the vernacular the variable or common parts of the Mass and Office.

8. The texts that may be rendered in music, and the order in which they are to be rendered, being determined for every liturgical function, it is not lawful to confuse this order or to change the prescribed texts for others selected at will, or to omit them either entirely or even in part, unless when the rubrics allow that some versicles of the text be supplied with the organ, while these versicles are simply recited in choir. However it is permissible, according to the custom of the Roman Church, to sing a motet to the Blessed Sacrament after the "Benedictus" in a Solemn Mass. It is also permitted, after the offertory prescribed for the Mass has been sung, to execute during the time that remains a brief motet to words approved by the Church.

9. The liturgical text must be sung as it is in the books without alteration or inversion of the words, without undue repetition, without breaking syllables and always in a manner intelligible to the faithful who listen.

IV.

EXTERNAL FORM OF THE SACRED COMPOSITIONS.

10. The different parts of the Mass and the Office must retain, even musically, that particular concept and form which ecclesiastical tradition has assigned to them, and which is admirably expressed in the Gregorian Chant. Different, therefore, must be the method of composing an Introit, a Gradual, an antiphon, a psalm, a hymn, a "Gloria in Excelsis."

11. In particular the following rules are to be observed:

(a) The "Kyrie," "Gloria," "Credo," etc., of the Mass must preserve the unity of composition proper to their text. It is not lawful, therefore, to compose them in separate pieces, in such a way as that each of such pieces may form a complete composition in itself, and be capable of being detached from the rest and substituted by another.

(b) In the Office of Vespers it should be the rule to follow the

"Caerimoniale Episcoporum," which prescribes the Gregorian Chant for the psalmody and permits figured music for the versicles of the "Gloria Patri" and the hymn.

It will nevertheless be lawful on the greater solemnities to alternate the Gregorian Chant of the choir with the so-called "falsi-bordoni" or with verses similarly composed in a proper manner.

It may be also allowed sometimes to render the single psalms in their entirety in music, provided the form proper to psalmody be preserved in such compositions; that is to say, provided the singers seem to be psalmodising among themselves, either with new motifs or with those taken from the Gregorian Chant, or based upon it.

The psalms known as "di concerto" are, therefore, forever excluded and prohibited.

(c) In the hymns of the Church the traditional form of the hymn is preserved. It is not lawful, therefore, to compose, for instance, a "Tantum Ergo" in such wise that the first strophe presents a *romanza*, a *cavatina*, an *adagio* and the "Genitori" an *allegro*.

(d) The antiphons of the Vespers must be as a rule rendered with the Gregorian melody proper to each. Should they, however, in some special case be sung in figured music, they must never have either the form of a concert melody or the fullness of a motet or a cantata.

V.

THE SINGERS.

12. With the exception of the melodies proper to the celebrant at the altar and to the ministers, which must be always sung only in Gregorian Chant, and without the accompaniment of the organ, all the rest of the liturgical chant belongs to the choir of levites, and, therefore, singers in church, even when they are laymen, are really taking the place of the ecclesiastical choir. Hence the music rendered by them must, at least for the greater part, retain the character of choral music.

By this it is not to be understood that solos are entirely excluded. But solo singing should never predominate in such a way as to have the greater part of the liturgical chant executed in that manner; rather should it have the character of hint or a melodic projection, and be strictly bound up with the rest of the choral composition.

13. On the same principle it follows that singers in church have a real liturgical office, and that therefore women, as being incapable of exercising such office, cannot be admitted to form part of the choir or of the musical chapel. Whenever, then, it is desired to employ the acute voice of sopranos and contraltos, these parts must

be taken by boys, according to the most ancient usage of the Church.

14. Finally, only those are to be admitted to form part of the musical chapel of a church who are men of known piety and probity of life, and these should by their modest and devout bearing during the liturgical functions show that they are worthy of the holy office they exercise. It will also be fitting that singers while singing in church wear the ecclesiastical habit and surplice, and that they be hidden behind gratings when the choir is excessively open to the public gaze.

VI.

ORGAN AND INSTRUMENTS.

15. Although the music proper to the Church is purely vocal music, music with the accompaniment of the organ is also permitted. In some special cases, within due limits and within the proper regards, other instruments may be allowed, but never without the special license of the ordinary, according to the prescriptions of the "*Caerimoniale Episcoporum*."

16. As the chant school should always have the principal place, the organ or instruments should merely sustain and never overwhelm it.

17. It is not permitted to have the chant preceded by long preludes or to interrupt it with intermezzo pieces.

18. The sound of the organ as an accompaniment to the chant in preludes, interludes and the like must be not only governed by the special nature of the instrument, but must participate in all the qualities proper to sacred music as above enumerated.

19. The employment of the piano is forbidden in church, as is also that of noisy or frivolous instruments such as drums, cymbals, bells and the like.

20. It is strictly forbidden to have bands play in church, and only in a special case and with the consent of the ordinary will it be permissible to admit a number of wind instruments, limited, judicious and proportioned to the size of the place—provided the composition and accompaniment to be executed be written in a grave and suitable style, and similar in all respects to that proper to the organ.

21. In processions outside the church the ordinary may give permission for a band, provided no profane pieces are executed. It would be desirable in such cases that the band confine itself to accompanying some spiritual canticle sung in Latin or in the vernacular by the singers and the pious associations which take part in the procession.

VII.

THE LENGTH OF THE LITURGICAL CHANT.

22. It is not lawful to keep the priest at the altar waiting on account of the chant or the music for a length of time not allowed by the liturgy. According to the ecclesiastical prescriptions the "Sanctus" of the Mass should be over before the elevation, and therefore the priest must here have regard to the singers. The "Gloria" and the "Credo" ought, according to the Gregorian tradition, to be relatively short.

23. In general it must be considered to be a very grave abuse when the liturgy in ecclesiastical functions is made to appear secondary to and in a manner at the service of the music, for the music is merely a part of the liturgy and its humble handmaid.

VIII.

PRINCIPAL MEANS.

24. For the exact execution of what has been herein laid down, the Bishops, if they have not already done so, are to institute in their dioceses a special commission composed of persons really competent in sacred music, and to this commission let them entrust in the manner they find most suitable the task of watching over the music executed in their churches. Nor are they to see merely that the music is good in itself, but also that it is adapted to the powers of the singers and be always well executed.

25. In seminaries of clerics and in ecclesiastical institutions let the above-mentioned traditional Gregorian Chant be cultivated by all with diligence and love, according to the Tridentine prescriptions, and let the superiors be liberal of encouragement and praise towards their young subjects. In like manner let a "Scholae Cantorum" be established, whenever possible, among the clerics for the execution of sacred polyphony and of good liturgical music.

26. In the ordinary lessons of liturgy, morals, canon law given to the students of theology, let care be taken to touch on those points which regard more directly the principles and laws of sacred music, and let an attempt be made to complete the doctrine with some particular instruction in the æsthetic side of the sacred art, so that the clerics may not leave the seminary ignorant of all those notions, necessary as they are for complete ecclesiastical culture.

27. Let care be taken to restore, at least in the principal churches, the ancient "Scholae Cantorum," as has been done with excellent fruit in a great many places. It is not difficult for a zealous clergy to institute such "Scholae" even in the minor and country churches

—nay, in them they will find a very easy means for gathering round them both the children and the adults, to their own profit and the edification of the people.

28. Let efforts be made to support and promote in the best way possible the higher schools of sacred music where these already exist, and to help in founding them where they do not. It is of the utmost importance that the Church herself provide for the instruction of its masters, organists and singers, according to the true principles of sacred art.

IX.

CONCLUSION.

29. Finally, it is recommended to choirmasters, singers, members of the clergy, superiors of seminaries, ecclesiastical institutions and religious communities, parish priests and rectors of churches, canons of collegiate churches and cathedrals, and above all to the diocesan ordinaries to favor with all zeal these prudent reforms, long desired and demanded with united voice by all; so that the authority of the Church, which herself has repeatedly proposed them, and now inculcates them, may not fall into contempt.

Given from our Apostolic Palace at the Vatican, on the day of the Virgin and Martyr, St. Cecilia, November 22, 1903, in the first year of our Pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

POPULAR CATHOLIC ACTION.

PIUS X., POPE.

“MOTU PROPRIO.”

IN our first Encyclical to the Bishops of the world, in which we echo all that our glorious predecessors had laid down concerning the Catholic action of the laity, we declared that this action was deserving of the highest praise, and was indeed necessary in the present condition of the Church and of society. And we cannot but praise warmly the zeal shown by so many illustrious personages who have for a long time dedicated themselves to this glorious task, and the ardor of so many brilliant young people who have eagerly hastened to lend their aid to the same. The nineteenth Catholic Congress lately held at Bologna, and by us promoted and encouraged, has sufficiently proved to all the vigor of the Catholic forces as well as what useful and salutary results may be obtained among a population of believers, when this action is well governed and

disciplined, and when unity of thought, sentiment and action prevail among those who take part in it.

But we are very sorry to find that certain differences which arose in the midst of them have produced discussions unfortunately too vivacious, which, if not dispelled in time, might serve to divide those forces of which we have spoken, and render them less efficacious. Before the Congress we recommended above all things unity and harmony, in order that it might be possible to lay down by common accord the general lines for the practical working of the Catholic movement; we cannot therefore be silent now. And since divergences of view in matters of practice have commonly their origin in the domain of theory, and indeed necessarily find their fulcrum in the latter, it is necessary to define clearly the principles on which the entire Catholic movement must be based.

Our illustrious predecessor, Leo XIII., of holy memory, traced out luminously the rules that must be followed in the Christian movement among the people in the great Encyclicals "*Quod Apostolici muneris*," of December 28, 1878; "*Rerum novarum*," of May 15, 1891, and "*Graves de communi*," of January 18, 1901; and further in a particular Instruction emanating from the Sacred Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, of January 27, 1902.

And we, realizing, as did our predecessor, the great need that the Christian movement among the people be rightly governed and conducted, desire to have those most prudent rules exactly and completely fulfilled, and to provide that nobody may dare depart from them in the smallest particulars. Hence, to keep them more vividly present before people's minds, we have deemed it well to summarize them in the following articles, which will constitute the fundamental plan of Catholic popular movement.

FUNDAMENTAL REGULATIONS.

I. Human society, as established by God, is composed of unequal elements, just as the different parts of the human body are unequal; to make them all equal is impossible, and would mean the destruction of human society. (Encyclical, "*Quod Apostolici Muneris*.")

II. The equality existing among the various social members consists only in this: that all men have their origin in God the Creator, have been redeemed by Jesus Christ, and are to be judged and rewarded or punished by God exactly according to their merits or demerits. (Encyclical, "*Quod Apostolici Muneris*.")

III. Hence it follows that there are, according to the ordinance of God, in human society princes and subjects, masters and proletariat, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, nobles and plebeians,

all of whom, united in the bonds of love, are to help one another to attain their last end in heaven, and their material and moral welfare here on earth. (Encyclical, "Quod Apostolici Muneris.")

IV. Of the goods of the earth man has not merely the use, like the brute creation, but he has also the right of permanent proprietorship—and not merely of those things which are consumed by use, but also of those which are not consumed by use. (Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum.")

V. The right of private property, the fruit of labor or industry, or of concession or donation by others, is an incontrovertible natural right; and everybody can dispose reasonably of such property as he thinks fit. (Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum.")

VI. To heal the breach between rich and poor, it is necessary to distinguish between justice and charity. There can be no claim for redress except when justice is violated. (Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum.")

OBLIGATIONS OF JUSTICE.

VII. The following are obligations of justice binding on the proletariat and the workingman: To perform fully and faithfully the work which has been freely and, according to equity, agreed upon; not to injure the property or outrage the person of masters; even in the defense of their own rights to abstain from acts of violence, and never to make mutiny of their defense. (Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum.")

VIII. The following are obligations of justice binding on capitalists: To pay just wages to their workingmen; not to injure their just savings by violence or fraud, or by overt or covert usuries; not to expose them to corrupting seductions and danger of scandal; not to alienate them from the spirit of family life and from love of economy; not to impose on them labor beyond their strength, or unsuitable for their age or sex. (Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum.")

IX. It is an obligation for the rich and those who own property to succor the poor and the indigent, according to the precepts of the Gospel. This obligation is so grave that on the Day of Judgment special account will be demanded of its fulfilment, as Christ Himself has said (Matthew 25). (Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum.")

X. The poor should not be ashamed of their poverty, nor disdain the charity of the rich, for they should have especially in view Jesus the Redeemer, who, though He might have been born in riches, made Himself poor in order that He might ennoble poverty and enrich it with merits beyond price for heaven. (Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum.")

XI. For the settlement of the social question much can be done by the capitalists and workers themselves, by means of institutions

designed to provide timely aid for the needy and to bring together and unite mutually the two classes. Among these institutions are mutual aid societies, various kinds of private insurance societies, orphanages for the young, and, above all, associations among the different trades and professions. (Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum.")

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY.

XII. This end is especially aimed at by the movement of Christian Popular Action of Christian Democracy in its many and varied branches. But Christian Democracy must be taken in the sense already authoritatively defined. Totally different from the movement known as "Social Democracy," it has for its basis the principles of Catholic faith and morals—especially the principle of not injuring in any way the inviolable right of private property. Encyclical, "Graves de Communi.")

XIII. Moreover, Christian Democracy must have nothing to do with politics, and never be able to serve political ends or parties; this is not its field; but it must be a beneficent movement for the people, and founded on the law of nature and the precepts of the Gospel. (Encyclical, "Graves de Communi," Instructions of the S. Cong. of E. E. Affairs.)

Christian Democrats in Italy must abstain from participating in any political action—this is under present circumstances forbidden to every Catholic *for reasons of the highest order*. (Instructions as cited.)

XIV. In performing its functions, Christian Democracy is bound most strictly to depend upon ecclesiastical authority, and to offer full submission and obedience to the Bishops and those who represent them. There is no meritorious zeal or sincere piety in enterprises, however beautiful and good in themselves, when they are not approved by the pastor. (Encyclical, "Graves de Communi.")

XV. In order that the Christian Democratic movement in Italy may be united in its efforts, it must be under the direction of the Association of Catholic Congresses and Committees, which, during many years of fruitful labor, has deserved so well of Holy Church, and to which Pius IX. and Leo XIII., of holy memory, entrusted the charge of directing the whole Catholic movement, always, of course, under the auspices and guidance of the Bishops. (Encyclical, "Graves de Communi.")

CATHOLIC WRITERS.

XVI. Catholic writers must, in all that touches religious interests and the action of the Church in society, subject themselves entirely in intellect and will, like the rest of the faithful, to their Bishops and

to the Roman Pontiff. They must above all, take care not to anticipate the judgments of the Holy See in this important matter. (Instruction as cited.)

XVII. Christian Democratic writers must, like all other Catholic writers, submit to the previous examination of the ordinary all writings which concern religion, Christian morals and natural ethics, by virtue of the Constitution "*Officiorum et munerum*" (Art. 41). By the same Constitution ecclesiastics must obtain the previous consent of the ordinary for publication of writings of a merely technical character. (Instruction.)

XVIII. They must, moreover, make every effort and every sacrifice to ensure that charity and harmony may reign among them. When causes of disagreement arise, they should, instead of printing anything on the matter in the papers, refer it to the ecclesiastical authority, which will then act with justice. And when taken to task by the ecclesiastical authority, let them obey promptly without evasion or public complaints—the right to appeal to a higher authority being understood when the case requires it; and it should be made in the right way. (Instruction.)

XIX. Finally, let Catholic writers take care, when defending the cause of the proletariat and the poor, not to use language calculated to inspire aversion among the people of the upper classes of society. Let them refrain from speaking of redress and justice when the matter comes within the domain of charity only, as has been explained above. Let them remember that Jesus Christ endeavored to unite all men in the bond of mutual love, which is the perfection of justice, and which carries with it the obligation of working for the welfare of one another. (Instruction.)

The foregoing fundamental rules we of our own initiative and with certain knowledge do renew by our apostolic authority in all their parts, and we ordain that they be transmitted to all Catholic committees, societies and unions of every kind. All these societies are to keep them exposed in their rooms and to have them read frequently at their meetings. We ordain, moreover, that Catholic papers publish them in their entirety and make declaration of their observance of them—and, in fact, observe them religiously; failing to do this they are to be gravely admonished, and if they do not then amend, let them be interdicted by ecclesiastical authority.

But as words and energetic action are of no avail unless preceded, accompanied and followed constantly by example, the necessary characteristic which should shine forth in all the members of every Catholic association is that of openly manifesting their faith by the holiness of their lives, by the spotlessness of their morals and by

the scrupulous observance of the laws of God and of the Church. And this because it is the duty of every Christian, and also in order that he "who stands against us may blush, having nothing evil to say of us." (Tit. ii., 8.)

From this solicitude of ours for the common good of Catholic action, especially in Italy, we hope, through the blessing of God, to reap abundant and happy fruits.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on December 18, 1903, in the first year of our Pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

TRUNCATED ETHICS.

I.

SCIENTIFICALLY our age is marked by its tendency to specialize or to separate the field of science into distinct enclosures, while philosophically, at least in the monistic school, the tendency is to treat nothing as strictly individual or as properly knowable outside its relations to the rest of the universe. Anything considered in itself is said to be taken abstractly, incompletely and so far falsely; the only true concrete is the *Universitas Rerum*. Now many persons at present want so to isolate Ethics as to have what they call an Independent Ethics, set forth as a science rather than as a philosophy. Let Professor J. Seth furnish an example of the demand. "The Science of Ethics has nothing to do with the question of the freedom of the will, for example. As the science of morality Ethics has a right to assume that man is a moral being, since his judgments about conduct imply the idea of morality. But whether this scientific conception is finally valid or invalid, whether the moral judgments are trustworthy or illusory, and whether or not their validity implies the freedom of man as a moral being, are problems for metaphysics to solve. Ethics does not base its view of human life, its system of moral judgments upon any metaphysical interpretation of reality, whether idealistic or materialistic, although here as elsewhere the scientific result must form an all-important datum for metaphysics. Similarly, the problem of good or of the ultimate reality—the relation of man's moral ideal to the universe of which he is a part—is a question not for Ethics, but for metaphysics. Ethics as a science abstracts human nature from the rest of the universe. It is as frankly anthropocentric as the natural sciences are cosmocentric. Whether or not in our ultimate interpre-

tation of reality we must shift our centre is a question which metaphysics must answer."¹

As a preliminary to discussing the question here raised it is important to observe that sciences do not automatically classify themselves. Comte laboriously attempted a natural distribution of them; other authors have given other schemes; no plan is so essentially right that it is simply the plan that must be accepted. Again, some sciences more easily admit of isolation than others; Mathematics are more completely separable than Ethics. Hence let us lay down the fundamental proposition: The science of Ethics has not its whole boundaries marked out for it objectively and *à priori*; its limits will have to be settled partly by agreement, on a balance of advantages and disadvantages, not without regard to the special times in which we live. There will be room for variable practice among authors.

We will seek to let in some light upon the question by considering two actual experiments, one old and one new. Aristotle has been quoted as furnishing a very good basis on which to write for Catholic schools a text-book of Independent Ethics. Nevertheless it will have to be admitted that he makes certain excursions into theology, and after we have said what these are it will be useful to mention why he was driven into these deeper problems; for the significance of his action herein may be far beyond the brevity of his references themselves and his sense of their importance.

a. Inevitably at times Aristotle, especially when he is dealing with man's perfection or beatitude, catches glimpses of the truth that human nature is not all in all as regards morality. Happiness, though human in his eyes, is also somehow superhuman; it belongs especially to the divine element in man, the reason, which perhaps is not like the soul, perishable with the body, though it is not distinctly asserted to survive individually. "The blessed life indeed would be beyond what human nature could compass, for it does not belong to man so to live, since such a life is proper to something within him that is divine."² On the other hand, in an earlier part of the same work (I. 10) Aristotle had insisted that virtue is a human thing and that the search of the moralist should be after a virtue that is human and a blessedness that is human, namely, some grateful energy of the soul. We need not attempt the conciliation, as the question is not pressing just now.

b. In connection with the divine character of moral conduct and of beatitude Aristotle further illustrates our point by touching on an all-important subject which many moralists overlook. He tells

¹ "Ethical Principles," third edition, pp. 32, 33. In Part III. the author devotes 107 pages to the Metaphysical and Theological basis of Ethics.

² "Eth. Prin.," x., 7.

us that man's aim is self-development, self-completion, bringing out of himself all that he has in him to become, evolving his best self; and we might naturally conclude that man's final state of beatitude is the product of his own effort, just as the development of the body by calisthenics and of mental powers by study is the outcome of his own exertion. So understood, man, in the natural order, would be said to work out his own salvation, to be self-made in his beatitude. But what if his beatitude is a gift of God or a reward bestowed for virtue? This idea, if it could be established, would be a rude disturber of many a complacent theory of self-evolution. Now, Aristotle thinks it worthy of a passing remark, though his own theological penury alone would keep him from saying much on the subject. He briefly observes: "Confessedly if anything is a gift of the gods to men it is reasonable that blessedness should be God-given, especially as it is the best thing that man can have. However, this matter would, perhaps, more properly be assigned to another branch of the inquiry." (I. 9.) The admission here is scanty and grudging, and it is in part withdrawn by the context; nevertheless, it does show the glimpse of a truth which is of vital importance. If Ethics has for part of its office to describe how final beatitude is reached by the virtuous man, and if there is no finality in this world, and if God as Rewarder gives beatitude in another world, then Ethics ought not wholly to be silent on the point, especially with a silence that looks like a denial.

c. In yet another point Aristotle, on occasion, rises superior to his general self. He bargained only for happiness during a length of days upon earth with fortune and friends. He spoke of Solon's maxim, "Call no man happy till he is dead" as not warranting any certainty of future life, but as pertaining to a mortal career. (I. 7 and 10.) Yet the prompting is present to him that eternity is what man should look to for real satisfaction; there is no beatitude which is to be confined to the space of three score and ten years. "So far as we can," writes Aristotle, "we must assert the immortal element within ourselves." (X. 7.)

In the above casual utterances of Aristotle, a man without fixed theology, we claim to find perceptions of something beyond the substance of his Independent Ethics, and that something he notices with a sort of inevitability.

Next we take up a modern writer who has been specially mentioned as independent in his Ethics. Sir Leslie Stephen, dissatisfied with mere Utilitarianism, seeks to complete its doctrines by working somewhat on the lines of Darwin and Spencer. Evolutionists hold that morality is part of the natural process. When Huxley, in one of his last lectures, declared that the Ethical process

reversed the Cosmic, he was hailed by some as a repentant sinner who had given up his naturalism; but he hastened to declare that such was not the case; he only wished to speak of nature turning round upon herself and originating a new method of her own. "I do not know that any one," he protests, "has taken more pains than I have during the last thirty years to insist upon the doctrine so much reviled in the earlier part of that period, that man, physical, intellectual and moral, is as much a part of nature, as purely a product of the Cosmic process, as the humblest weed."³ Now from this principle the Independent Ethics of Sir Leslie Stephen is not independent; so that if we Catholics make our Ethics independent of the contrary view to his, we are giving more than we receive. Sir Leslie regards pleasure and pain as the sole springs of human action; he thinks that not logical judgment, but its connected feeling is the determinant of our choice, which choice is never free in the popular sense. Man as a member of society seeks the good of himself and his fellows; and for all men the final standard of moral good is not exactly the happiness of the race, but "the well-being," "the health," "the efficiency," "the self-preservation of the social organism." The moral law is the statement of certain essential conditions of the vitality of society; the individual, so far as moral, must be capable of aiming at the social welfare before "his own."⁴ "Morality is the sum of the preservative instincts of society."⁵ "The moral code is the statement of the conditions of social vitality."⁶ In propositions of this kind, Sir Leslie thinks that he has got what even John Stuart Mill's improved Utilitarianism does not furnish, a statement which satisfies the condition of a scientific criterion.

Depending on this as his criterion—for even Independent Ethics cannot be independent of a basis—the author shows us what his decisions are concerning a few moral matters. For instance: "If, in some distant planet, lying were as essential to human welfare as truthfulness is in this world, falsehood might be a cardinal virtue."⁷ Again, if from a lofty motive, not from cowardice, with relief to himself and to others, and without betraying the fact to others, a man commit suicide Sir Leslie sees "no ground for disapproval of the action."⁸ The social organism may be none the unhealthier for the loss of such a member, and the member seems to have nothing to gain by clinging to the organism. On the principles of the

³ "Evolution and Ethics," p. 11.

⁴ "Ethical Science," chap. vi.

⁵ *Id.*, chap. v.

⁶ *Id.*, chap. vii.

⁷ *Id.*, chap. iv.

⁸ *Id.*, chap. ix.

Utilitarianism which Sir Leslie thinks insufficient, he remarks that we should have to draw a conclusion which he thus plainly expresses: "Nature, if I may use that convenient personification for things considered as part of a continuous system, wants big, strong, hearty, eupeptic, shrewd, sensible human beings, and would be grossly inconsistent if she bestowed her highest reward of happiness upon a bilious, scrofulous, knock-kneed saint, merely because he has a strong objection to adultery, drunkenness, murder, robbery or the utter absence of malice or even highly cultivated sympathies. You can only raise a presumption that a moral excellence coincides closely with a happy nature, if you extend *moral* to include all admirable qualities, whether they are or are not specifically moral products of altruistic feeling."⁹ Can you do much better on the author's own criterion of "social vitality," "social self-preservation?"

Now if we will weigh facts already adduced and add a few others, it will appear that Sir Leslie Stephen's Independent¹⁰ Ethics really trench largely on our cherished beliefs about the essential foundations of morality. In his Ethics, after pronouncing them not bound up with the free-will question, he spends much labor to establish determination of the will; after pronouncing them free from the theistic controversy, he says¹¹ that Ontology is a vain attempt to spin out of the word "a demonstration of the ultimate nature of things in general." Nominally neutral as to future life, the one future life which he regards as interesting to the moralists, is the future of our own race upon earth, and this, he thinks, may, after a time, cease to make progress and start on its decline. Huxley is more outspoken on this degeneration, telling us that "The theory of evolution encourages no millennium. If for millions of years our globe has taken the upward road, yet some time the summit will be reached and the downward route will be commenced." We may yet improve much before the decline sets in, but "I deem it an essential condition of the realization of that hope that we should cast aside the notion that escape from pain and sorrow is the proper object of life."¹² So farewell, human beatitude.

A noteworthy consequence of probable degeneration is that with

⁹ His is the work instanced along with the "Moral Order and Progress" of S. Alexander to support the statement of Mr. Muirhead that in recent times "attempts have been made to detach ethics from the cumbrous adjuncts of logic and metaphysics, and to present it as a science in no respect differing save in the complexity of its object and the importance of its concessions from other empirical sciences." ("The Elements of Ethics;" University Extension Manuals, pp. 6 and 7.

¹⁰ "Science of Ethics," chap. x. Mr. H. Sidgwick says the free-will dispute is not ethical, yet he discusses it at length in his "Methods of Ethics."

¹¹ "Evolution of Ethics," pp. 85, 86.

¹² "Science of Ethics," chap. 4.

it the moral standard will go back and friends to women's progress will have to contemplate a return to a past condition when the strong man was nature's favorite, her healthy specimen, and got things by brute force—got, for instance, his wife by knocking her down and carrying her off. "Then," grimly remarks Sir Stephen, "the ethical feminine character must have included a readiness to be knocked down, or at least an unreadiness to strike again."¹³

Briefly, our conclusions as to Independent Ethics are these: Such a treatise can be written and would have its use. It would deal with proximate rules for settling what is right in the details of human conduct, a settlement which no one could make merely by direct reference to the final goal of beatitude. Finite objects must be examined in the light of their congruity to the human agent. The moral actions of men from day to day are judged by their conformableness with reason. It is thus that reason—to omit revelation—is accustomed to decide ethically in favor of obedience to parents, love of neighbors, fidelity to wife or husband, honesty, truthfulness, temperance. Even the theist does not scientifically establish these virtues by a looking straight to heaven or to God, unless, of course, he is taking the standpoint of revelation, which is not that of Ethics. But now, as regards adding to these proximate rules of right and wrong, which may be claimed as proper to Independent Ethics: we are accustomed to take account also of their connection with God, the Creator and the Remunerator, and the object of certain direct duties to be paid by man, even in the purely natural order. The so-called Independent Ethics of Evolutionists and others attack these foundations and so challenge defense from us in our Ethics.

And next, quite apart from polemics, the very concrete science of Ethics does not so easily admit of isolation as does the very abstract science of mathematics. Ethics does not as easily abstract from God and life beyond the grave as physics abstracts from the ultimate constitution of matter. Especially Ethics which starts, as in Aristotle, with the question of man's beatitude, has a sort of necessity to go beyond the earthly range; and, accordingly, Aristotle himself has hinted at such an extension. He would have done more if he had been a Christian. It seems then, at least, a very defensible policy which modern treatises in the Catholic school have followed, that of completing the independent portion of Ethics by borrowing from natural theology certain conclusions about God and the human soul. These additions are not made matters of renewed demonstration, they are not treated at great length; they are taken as foundation stones and coping stones to complete an otherwise not wholly satisfactory edifice.

¹³ "The Map of Life;" New Impression, pp. 88, 89.

A further word as to imitating Aristotle in making the end of man or his beatitude the first point of departure. Independent Ethics tells us why we do this, that and the other in detail, according to the dictates of right reason in these particular subjects. So the proximate end of our ethical acts is assigned. But there remains the question with which only Dependent Ethics can satisfactorily deal. What is the goal of the whole man as such—the end of all his virtues and of his whole self or person? We cannot answer this inquiry without reference to God as alpha and omega; for if we leave out Him and His wisdom and His justice and His power, we find ourselves unsupported, without a guarantee that man has a satisfactory end and a refuge against pessimism. So it is maintainable that the usual practice of writers who have given us Ethics for Catholic readers, not to mention many other writers, is at least very defensible. Dependent Ethics has its ample justification, even if it leaves liberty to the Independent or to the comparatively Truncated Ethics of competing for a place in literature. The whole treatise of the latter will correspond to certain chapters of the former without contradiction; but only the larger survey will present an adequate picture.

II.

The second way of limiting the scope of Ethics is by declaring certain portions of conduct to be outside the reach of its general rules. Mr. Lecky, after quoting Cardinal Newman to the effect that not for the greatest gain upon earth is it permissible to commit the most venial of venial sins, makes the remark: "It is certainly no exaggeration to say that such a doctrine would lead to consequences absolutely incompatible with any life outside a hermitage or a monastery. It would strike at the root of all civilization, and though many may be prepared to give it a formal assent, no human being actually believes it with a belief that becomes a guiding influence in life. It supposes that the supreme object of humanity should be sinlessness, and it is manifest that the means to the end is absolute suppression of desires. To expand the circle of wants is to multiply temptations and, therefore, to increase the number of sins. No material and intellectual advantages, no increase of human happiness, no mitigation of the suffering or dreariness of human life can, according to this theory, be other than an evil if it adds in the smallest degree or even in the most incidental manner to the sins that are committed." Here Mr. Lecky in several ways misinterprets Newman for want of a knowledge of the theological system upon which the Cardinal wrote, and which between the evil consequences of our action distinguishes some which we are bound not to permit and others which we may permit. But before coming

to principle, let us gather from the work of Mr. Lecky already cited and from Mr. H. Sidgwick's book on "Practical Ethics," some examples in which the authors think that men cannot always be rigorously ethical if they are to live in human society as it is.

1. In international morality a certain degree of Machiavelism—*salus reipublicæ suprema lex*—seems inevitable. "If any one will study the remarkable catena of authorities quoted by Lord Acton in his introduction to Burd's edition of Machiavelli's 'Prince,' he will be left in doubt how far the proposition that statesmen are not subject in their public conduct even to the most fundamental rules of private morality, can properly be called a paradox."¹⁴

2. Party government, at least in England, its natural home, has proved very beneficial, but at the compromise of ethical principles. "In free countries party government is the best, if not the only, way of conducting affairs, but it is impossible without a large amount of moral compromise. Every one who is actually engaged in politics—every one especially who is a member of the House of Commons—must soon learn that if the absolute independence of individual judgment were pushed to its extreme, political anarchy would ensue."¹⁵ The author follows up the statement with an interesting account of party manœuvres as known to him from his own experience in Parliament.

3. Legal practice induces the lawyer to defend causes which he knows to be bad, or to go beyond the just claims of a fair cause, while quite recently the law itself was full of controversies meant to delay settlements, to multiply expenses and to open doors to fraudulent representations. "It must be acknowledged that up to a period extending far into the nineteenth century those lawyers who adopted the most technical view of their profession were acting fully in accordance with its spirit. Few, if any, departments of English legislation and administration were, till near the middle of the century, so scandalously bad as those connected with the administration of the civil and the criminal law, and especially with the Court of Chancery. The whole field was covered with a network of obscure, intricate, archaic technicalities; useless except for the purpose of piling up costs, procrastinating decisions, placing the simplest legal processes wholly beyond the competence of any but trained experts, giving endless facilities for fraud and for the evasion or the defeat of justice, turning a law case into a game in which chance had often vastly greater influence than substantial merits."¹⁶ Being betrayed into an untruth by his advocacy, St. Andrew Avellino threw up his profession. We cannot expect that heroism of the average pleader.

¹⁴ Sedgwick, p. 55.

¹⁵ Lecky, p. 120.

4. Subscription to religious formularies and the recitation of imposed creeds puzzle many clerics. The Anglican forms are as the Reformation left them; meantime thought in the national Church has changed much and questions arise how far a clergyman is justified in using the words of the past while giving them the sense which he supposes more true to modern enlightenment. A test case has been those words of the Apostles' Creed, "was conceived by the Holy Ghost." Is it enough for a candidate to tell his ordaining Bishop beforehand that he does not take this article in its plain sense? Or to say nothing to anybody because well-informed persons now accept the fact that ancient creeds are largely regarded as antiquated? Mr. Sidgwick has gone some way to find a solution for himself. "For a long time I thought it difficult to justify the non-withdrawal from communion in case of a member of the Anglican Church who could not literally pledge himself to the Apostles' Creed. But as the pledge to withdraw is at any rate only implied and as the common understanding of orthodox and unorthodox alike gives the implication no support, I now think it legitimate to regard the obvious though indirect import of the verbal pledge as relaxed by common understanding. At the same time, considering how vague and uncertain this appeal to a tacit common understanding must be and how explicit and solemn the pledge is, I do not think that any one who is a candidate for any educational or other post of trust, in which membership with the Church of England is required as a condition, ought to take advantage of this relaxation without making his position clear to those who appoint him to the post."¹⁷ Mr. Sidgwick's settlement drew from Mr. Rashdall a protest and thereon followed a rejoinder.

5. Both Mr. Lecky and Mr. Sidgwick give illustrations of conscientious difficulties raised by the received and, apparently, necessary practices of war; but those are too obvious to call for repetition.

On the side of Catholic Ethics, it has to be stated as a principle that Newman was right in his sweeping assertion that absolutely no desirable purpose can justify a venial sin, if the act in question does really remain a sin. Yet all are aware that what would be sinful under some circumstances is not sinful under others. To break through a neighbor's window with no chance of paying the damage is sinful where there is no urgency for such an act of violence; it is quite free from fault where there is a very strong urgency to gain a legitimate purpose. Hence our moralists, not so much in their ethical books as in their moral theologies, have

¹⁶ Lecky, pp. 117, 118.

¹⁷ Sidgwick, pp. 136, 137.

sought to lay down principles for guidance in intricate problems. Their main solution is given in the general statement, which often is exceedingly difficult of application, that a man may do an act from which he foresees evil results—especially results due to the free choice of another—provided his act itself is not bad; provided he is not using an evil means to a good end, and provided his good end is important enough to balance the evil effect which he is permitting. An example will illustrate this obscure and baldly expressed rule and the example shall be from Mr. Lecky. He thinks that bank holidays may be allowed, though he fancies that Newman's doctrine is inconsistent with such tolerance. If he had consulted the books which Newman studied in Rome, he would have found in principle a bank holiday is defensible as an institution, not in itself wrong, not depending on the abuses of it for the innocent recreation which it gives to those who use it aright, and having in its uses a sufficient counterbalance to its abuses. It is true, however, that in tolerated practices it is often hard to say that the good effect predominates over the bad. Take, for instance, certain fashions of dress, or of dancing, which in themselves are just not indecent. Suppose some persons who, as far as they themselves are concerned, can innocently adopt these customs, but who are perplexed in conscience about their effect on general company. Is not the good derived from the self-indulgence far outweighed by the occasions of sin offered to others by the evilly suggestive usages? Hence we may often strongly commend abstinence, Still if it is brought to the issue of absolute right, often we have a difficult problem, in which we shall have to remember that those who take scandal do so by their own free will and cannot compel their neighbors to the adoption of extraordinary precautions in order to avoid the suggestion of evil.

However, this is not the place to work out the solution of problems like the above; all we wish to say is that without using a perverse ingenuity to escape the charge of wrong-doing, we should do our best to discover a casuistry which will help to bring under a reasoned theory the cases which perplex consciences. Difficulties may arise wherein Englishmen especially are inclined to say that theory is impossible and that we must simply make up our minds that in such instances the principle of morals may be set aside, That is the attitude of some whose rough confession is that while as a rule we should be truthful, occasionally we must regretfully make up our minds to tell lies; that while as a rule we should not be fraudulent, at times the pressure of life requires that we meet a fraudulent world with its own weapon, again, of course, regretfully. The aim of casuistry is to discover whether apparent lies

or apparent frauds may not sometimes be other than they seem, because a needful element in the definition of such a sin has vanished under the circumstances. Such a quest may be conducted quite honestly, though it will be always liable to abuse, either from bad reasoning or bad will.

In the Catholic Church, after many years of supervised labor, a fairly successful result has been reached. Of the progress of the work, Pascal in his time had made quite an insufficient study to enable him authoritatively to pronounce; and, needless to add, those who have only read Pascal are not qualified by their studies to judge. The "Lettres Provinciales" have added forcibly to an *à priori* inclination to suspect casuistry of sophistication or of dishonesty. Nevertheless, we are confident in our decision that instances such as those collected by Mr. Lecky and Mr. H. Sidgwick indicate the urgency for some moral deportment of science which will save a man from the illogical position of saying that occasionally he is justified in doing certain wrong actions because he lives in a world that is bad under many aspects. Unless by some reflex process we can find a justification for our conduct, we are always committing an offense against morals by what we do in seeming violation of the common requirements of truthfulness and honesty.

JOHN RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

THE CROSS:

VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF LEGEND, TRADITION, PROPHECY AND HISTORY; ALSO OF AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN RESEARCHES.

THE mystic inwardness of the Cross; its outward potency; its world-wide manifestation more universally witnessed than its own prophetic Star of Bethlehem—who can feel or witness these phenomena and inspirations without asking within his soul, *What mystery is this?*

The Cross, consecrated by the blood of man's Redeemer; the emblem of our Faith, Hope and Charity; the sign of our salvation, is at once, and at all times, the proudest heritage and possession of the Christian. The Cross is our beacon light and fountain of grace on earth; it is our standard of triumph and glory in heaven; in time the most beautiful of trees, in eternity decked in perennial bloom and fruit. It accompanies us with blessings from the cradle to the grave—the first impress on the brow of infancy, the last anointing

emblem on the heart of expiring manhood. From the deepest and darkest catacombs to the highest and brightest sunlit spires of our Christian temples it sheds a mild yet potent and unfading lustre. Clasped to the purest heart of virgin sisterhood in cloister and in cell, it ever fires the lion-heart of the Crusader in the dreary march and in the bloody field of battle. Subject of promise and of prophecy from primeval ages, yet the world is amazed, dazzled, ecstatic, at the fullness of its consummation on Calvary. Nothing less than eternity is long enough to realize the infinite perfection of its goodness. Its mystic meaning, its place in sacred prophecy and in accomplished historical fulfilment, its universal *cultus* in all ages and in all lands, its almost endless variety of forms and names in archæological researches, its exaltation from an ignoble instrument of penal torture and death to be the crowning emblem in the diadems of Pontiffs and Kings, its unceasing well-springs of spiritual graces, its emblematic significance as the instrument of redemption and as the emblem of every noble hope, the sign of our own true faith, the daily companion of our lives and our sheet-anchor at the hour of our deaths—all these, and a thousand other titles, bind the Cross indissolubly to our lives, our aspirations, our struggles, our battles, our victories and our final triumphant end.

If we would, we could not escape the Cross. Everything on earth and in the heavens reminds us of it. Saints and anchorites spent days and many hours of the night in silent and wrapt contemplation of it. And with them we behold the sacred emblem everywhere in nature; we see it in every individual star of the heavens; we see it in combination in the Constellation of the Southern Cross; in the birds flying through the air with their outstretched wings; in the ships at sea with their masts and cross-arms; in the tree with its trunks and cross-branches; in the pavements on which we make our daily walks; in the crossing streets of our cities through which we push our way; in the architecture of church and domicile; in our every fellow-being we meet, who, like ourselves and like the God-man Himself, our Redeemer, who died upon the Cross, forms a thousand times a day the Cross with His outstretched arms.

But we of the twentieth century see the Cross even more than the anchorites and hermits, and in more points of God's creation; for if we look through the great telescope at the most distant and invisible stars and systems of stars and universes, or through the finely searching microscope at the beautiful snowflake or the minutest internal structure of the smallest flower—there, and everywhere, we behold the Cross. The very earth upon which we live, this beautiful planet, is constructed of endless crosses; endless in numbers

and varieties. Composed of inorganic matter, it shows in the mineral kingdom the Cross in all its endless forms of crystallization; every crystal presents to us the Cross as exemplified in rocks, metals and minerals, from the crude carbon to the brilliant diamond. What could be more beautiful or worthy of our study than the formation of ice, or still more of the formations of frost on the window-glass, in which myriads of varied crosses are seen in the midst of exquisite pictures of cathedrals, domes, minarets, mountains, plains, rivers and trees of the varied miniature landscape?

Not only in the material world, but still more in the moral and religious world, for there is scarcely a nation or clime or religion without the Cross; it is the favored theme of poet and historian, of monk and hermit, of moralist, theologian and mystic, and of the ancient and mediæval Fathers of the Church.

I recall the eloquent language of St. John Chrysostom in his "Discourse on the Divinity of Christ:" "The Cross shines resplendent at the sacred table, in the ordinations of the priests and in the mystic supper of the Lord's body. You behold it blazoned everywhere; in private houses and in the public forum; in the deserts and in the streets; on mountains, in meadows and on hills; on the sea, in ships, in islands; on couches, on garments and on armor; in the bed chambers and the banqueting room; on vessels of gold and silver, on jewels and in pictures; on the bodies of distempered animals, on the bodies of persons possessed by the devil; in war and in peace; by day and by night; in the festival of the dancers and amid the mortifications of the penitent—with so much earnestness do all, without exception, cultivate this wondrous gift and its ineffable grace. No one is ashamed or put to blush by the thought that it is the symbol of an accursed death; but we all feel ourselves more adorned thereby than by crowns, diadems and collars loaded with pearls; it shines everywhere: on the walls of our houses, on the ceilings of our apartments, in our books; in cities and in villages; in deserts and in cultivated fields. . . . Behold the Cross upon the purple and on the diadem; in our prayers, in the midst of armies; at the sacred tables; its glory shines throughout the world more brightly than the sun."

I recall also the words of Tertullian: "We impress the sign upon our foreheads whenever we move, when we enter in or go out, in going to the bath, at meals, in our conversation and when we return to rest. If you ask the Scripture authority for this and such like practices, I answer, there is none; but there is tradition that authorizes, custom that confirms, and submission that observes."

A beautiful and interesting illustration of the intimate tendency of the human soul to behold and draw spiritual and daily practical

consolation from the Cross, in the constant eventualities of life, is given by a modern artist, who artistically portrayed his vision or conception of the Cross on canvas. The artist depicted the home of the Holy Family at Nazareth and the carpenter's shop. The future Saviour, then a youth of about fourteen years, is depicted as going out of the house; a load of carpenter's materials or timbers had just been unloaded and thrown in front of the door; two pieces of timber accidentally fell across each other so as to form a perfect Cross; the Saviour's steps are at once arrested as His eyes caught a sight of the instrument of his future torture and death; with folded arms and riveted eyes He gazes upon the Cross, and stands in wrapt contemplation of His own Crucifixion.

The Cross in most ancient times was at once an instrument of personal ornament and of religious devotion, just as it is in the present day. The *Crux Ansata* was always an object of special veneration among the Egyptians, and it represented the active and passive principles embodied in Osiris and Isis. The Egyptian word signifying life was nearly the same as the Hindoo word of the same meaning. The Cross was also regarded as the symbol of eternal life, as well as of the new life given to neophytes after their initiation into the Sacred Mysteries, both among the Egyptians and the Hindoos, a feature bearing a striking resemblance to Christian customs. The *Crux Ansata* is a constant object found on Egyptian monuments of Khorsabad and on the ivory tablets of Nimrud, and it is carved on the walls of the cave-temples of India. When the Serapeum at Alexandria was destroyed by the order of Theodosius, the Christians saw in the *Crux Ansata* on the stories a prophetic sign of the coming of Christ, and they thus modeled the sign of their own redemption. From this time this peculiar form of Cross is to be found on Christian monuments, and some suppose it is the origin of the monogram of Christ.

There are two monograms of Christ; one composed of the two first Greek letters of Christ's name and the other is composed of the Greek initials of Jesus Christ. But these monograms of Christ are believed to be of an earlier date than the destruction of the temple of Serapis. The British, Irish and Gallic Celts used the Cross as a common symbol. The shamrock received an additional sacredness from its resemblance to the Cross, as did the trefoil of the Druids. So also among the Scandinavians the terrible hammer of Thor, which was used in battle and also to impart benediction at the marriage ceremony, was a cross. The ancient Danes placed in their shell mounds the cruciform hammer of Thor with the hole for the shaft at the intersection of the arms. Among the Scandinavians the hammer of Thor was a prom-

inent and significant object of devotion or national pride, both at their religious feasts, in battle, in their homes and in their drinking carousals. It was also used in sacrificing victims to Thor. Our own Longfellow gives us the poetic version of King Olaf's song while keeping the Christmas or Uhle feast of his country:

O'er his drinking horns the sign
He made of the Cross Divine,
As he drank, and muttered his prayers;
But the Bersecks evermore
Made the sign of the hammer of Thor.

The Cross appears on the sacred emblem of Vishnu and on the swastika of Buddha; on Celtic monuments and on the arms containing the ashes of eminent Etruscans, in the Phœnician tombs of Cypress and on ancient Greek coins, such as those of Chalcedon, Syracuse and Corinth. Fine specimens of some of these were brought by a Catholic archæologist, General di Cesnola, to the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art, where they can now be seen. The Indian great temples at Benares and Multra and many Druidical monuments are cruciform.

As an instrument of punishment and execution the Cross succeeded among ancient nations the practice of hanging criminals to trees. Like the gallows of more recent times, it was of old set up in public places to deter criminals. The transverse arm was frequently separate from the upright arm, and the former is supposed to have been the only part of the Cross which the condemned was forced to carry to the place of execution, unlike the case of our Saviour, who, according to tradition and legendary art, was compelled to carry the whole Cross to Calvary, and fell beneath its weight. In the early centuries of our era the pagans of Rome used to accuse the Christians of worshiping an ass' head, and this explains a design recently found drawn on a wall in a place of the Cæsars on the Palatine, and attributed to the third century, showing a crucified victim bearing an ass' head. In the *Cruce commissa*, the form on which our Saviour is supposed to have died, there is usually fixed over the head of the victim an upright rod to hold an inscription, and there are many specimens of this kind on the early tombs of Christians. The catacombs, according to the eminent Roman archæologist, De Rossi, contain numerous examples of the *Cruce emissa* prior to the fifth century and dating from the second, but no other forms of the Cross prior to that.

From having been a despised and derided object of criminal torture and execution, the Cross became about the second century an object of great and special veneration, and even in the Apostolic age, for it was one of the noblest words of St. Paul when he exclaimed, "God forbid that I should ever rejoice in anything save

in the Cross of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." But in the second Christian century great veneration and efficacy were attributed to the Cross; it was seen everywhere in Christian communities; it was impressed or carved on wood, stone and metal, on tombs, altars and religious structures, and even in front of dwellings; and the sign of the Cross was marked on the person, used in the ritual and in the administration of the sacraments.

In the catacombs the Cross is frequently seen accompanied by other emblematic figures, such as the dove, the serpent, the circle as emblematic of eternity, the anchor, alpha and omega and the fish, the last having an especial significance, inasmuch as the Greek letters composing it were the initials for "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour." Constantine the Great, who was led to his victory over Maxentius by a brilliant Cross in the skies and to his own conversion, made the previously hated sign of dishonor the proud symbol that thenceforth glittered on the shields and armors of the imperial Roman armies, and he caused crosses to be erected on the highways.

The Cross, however, bears its most conspicuous honors in ecclesiastical and hierarchical spheres. It is borne before the Pope everywhere; by patriarchs everywhere out of Rome, by primates, metropolitans and by all ecclesiastics wearing the pallium, within their jurisdictions. The Papal Cross has three cross arms, symbolical of the Pope's three jurisdictions, the ecclesiastical, the civil and the judicial; the Cross of patriarchs has two cross arms, and the Cross of an Archbishop has only one arm. The Cross of the Crusaders was originally *red*, but in course of time the different nations had crosses of different colors.

In Catholic countries there were several forms of architectural crosses, such as the boundary Cross, which defined civil or ecclesiastical limits, and sometimes possessed the mediæval right of sanctuary; the market Cross, which answered the double purposes of shelter from storms and as notice that the market tolls belonged to the neighboring monastery, and some of these still remain in England; the preaching Cross, from which sermons were delivered and proclamations read; the memorial Cross marked the scene of battles, murders, processions or other noted events; and of this there still remains in England a beautiful specimen in the fifteen beautiful memorial crosses which Edward I. had erected at the fifteen places where the remains of his queen, Eleanor, rested in their removal from Grantham to Westminster, one of which fifteen crosses, a beautiful example of which has been restored, still stands at Waltham.

As far as is known, the first public ceremonial or congregational Adoration of the Cross occurred in Jerusalem, in the year 326, when

St. Helena, the mother of the Emperor Constantine the Great, having found the true Cross on which our Saviour died, had that sacred relic exposed to the veneration of the faithful. At that time the Latin word *adoro* meant to venerate. From this moment the custom of venerating the Cross arose in the Church of Jerusalem, soon extended throughout the East and the West and became universal. We will relate hereafter, in giving the history of the true Cross, how a portion of the sacred relic was preserved in Jerusalem, and St. Paulinus informs us of the solemn ceremony observed annually thereafter at Jerusalem on Good Friday of bringing this piece of the Cross and exposing it to the veneration of the faithful. St. Thomas of Tours and Venerable Bede mention the same custom, and a piece of the true Cross which was carried to Constantinople was also exposed on Good Friday to the veneration of the faithful in the great Church of St. Sophia, now unfortunately a Mahomedan mosque. In the Western Church we find the same custom mentioned in the most ancient of the Roman Sacramentaries, that of Pope Gelatius, as approved and corrected by the learned Muratori. The antiquity of the rite is proved by the uniformity in its language in different countries. The antiphon which we now use in our American churches is the same as that given in the Antiphonary of St. Gregory, and in the Roman order referred by Mabillon to the time of St. Gregory. The original ceremony referred to the true Cross of Christ, in proof of which we need only cite the language of the antiphon itself: "Behold the wood of the Cross whereon our Salvation hung." Tracing back the ceremony to the time of St. Helena and the finding of the Cross, the ceremony means in fact not only a supreme worship of God Himself and Him crucified and a veneration of the instrument of His sacred death, but it is also a commemoration historically of the finding and of the exaltation of the Cross, even though the Church has since assigned two separate festivals to the commemoration of these great events, as we will hereafter relate. The ceremony of Good Friday also celebrates, as Cardinal Wiseman suggests, the liberation of the Church and the triumph of Christianity under the first Christian Emperor, Constantine the Great.

Christians were never accused of idolatry at the time of the first adoration of the Cross at Jerusalem in the year 326; there were no Iconoclasts in that day to destroy the true Cross of Christ, then recently found and now transmitted to posterity for its veneration. So also we trace the use of the word *adore* through ages of the Church which were distinguished by their hatred of idolatry. In the verses of "Lactantius," the most ancient poem we now possess on the Passion, the touching language is, "Flecte genu, lignumque

crucis venerabile adora." So also Bishop Simeon gives us an account of the death of an ancient martyr and his daughter, who were put to death for refusing to worship the pagan idols of their day, and who certainly would not commit an act of idolatry at the very moment they were giving their lives for refusing to commit that crime. The Christian martyr thus addressed his judge: "I and my daughter were baptized in the Holy Trinity, and the Cross I adore; and for Him (Christ) I will willingly die, as will my daughter." From this Oriental authority we may turn to the Greeks, who also used the same word, which meant to salute reverently and humbly; and thus we find in the old Greek version of St. Ephrem, the oldest of the old Syriac Fathers, a version made in his own lifetime or very soon afterwards, the following words: "The Cross ruleth, which all nations adore, and all people." We may thus safely follow the suggestion of Bossuet, and the clear and positive opinion of Cardinal Wiseman in his "Lectures on Holy Week," that the meaning of the word *adoro*, originally used to describe the ceremony and services of Good Friday, in the sense of veneration, has undergone a change in its meaning, and that the modern words, *Adoration of the Cross*, though historically and liturgically correct, do not now convey the real significance and true expression of the sentiments of the Church and of the faithful. And yet it is wise to adhere, in her liturgy, to the Latin language, as containing the permanent landmarks and tests of meaning in all ages and thus, too, to the ancient word, *Adoro*; for if once the Church commenced to modify and change her liturgy and her language, or to follow the constant changes of modern languages and the effect of such changes upon the Latin, there would be no end of changes, and the standard of uniformity would be lost or impaired. "The word, therefore," says Cardinal Wiseman, "signified veneration, and the rite must be more ancient than the modern meaning of 'supreme worship' which it now bears."

But veneration for the Cross, apart from the publicity given to it by St. Helena in the year 326, did not originate at the finding of the true Cross, when for the first time the public Adoration of the True Cross of Calvary took place. The crosses in the Roman Catacombs of the earliest Christian years show that the Church, prior to that and from the earliest times, held the Cross as an object of religious veneration. The Syriac Father, St. Ephrem, already quoted, says that all nations and peoples adored the Cross. Not only is this true, but still further is it certain from tradition, history and archæology that nearly all nations and peoples adored the Cross from the earliest ages, and tradition carries this qualified or inferior worship of the Cross back to our first parents. The following

tribute to this ancient *cultus* is from the pen of a Protestant minister, Rev. William Haslam, who learnedly and correctly regarded it as typical and prophetic of the Cross of Calvary, the Cross of Redemption. He writes: "We turn now to the Sign of the Cross, which we have been tracing indirectly into the remotest antiquity. The reader will remember we traced it first in its outward material form and alleged import among the principal nations of the primeval world. That alone suggested the conclusion to which our subsequent inquiry into the antiquity of the alphabet has actually brought us, namely, that the Cross was known to Noah before the Dispersion, and even before the flood; and I will venture yet further and say, the Cross was known to Adam, and that the knowledge of it as a sacred sign was imparted to him by the Almighty."

Innumerable authorities could be cited as favoring the same view of the immense antiquity and universality of the *cultus* of the Cross, but the archæological remains of all the primitive nations speak in unmistakable language, for there is scarcely a primitive nation whose ruins do not contain crosses in almost endless forms and varieties, together with unmistakable evidences of the practice of *cruci-cultus*, as I shall show in this paper by the researches of the learned and scientific.

The *cultus* of the Cross degenerated into idolatry with every nation except the Jews, and with every religion except Christianity, of which the Jewish faith was the precursor. This *cultus* is based upon tradition, which under the idolatrous religions of pagan nations assumed the most varied and often grotesque and distorted forms. But in the Christian mediæval times this ancient tradition assumed the form of a legend known as the *Legend of the Cross*.

This was one of the most popular legends of the Middle Ages, if we may judge from the frequency with which it was represented in the gorgeous stained glass windows and in the frescoes of the churches and cathedrals of that religious age. In the churches of Troyes alone it is finely represented on the windows of S. Martin-es-Vignas, of S. Pantaleon, S. Madeleine and S. Nizier. So, too, on the walls of the choir of the Church of S. Croce at Florence, by the hand of Agnolo Gaddi. Again we find the pencil of Pietro della Francesca devoting itself to the delineation of the legendary history of the Cross in the great frescoes in the chapel of the Bacci, in the Church of S. Francesco at Arezzo. Among the specimens of early art in the Academia delle Belli Arti at Venice it occurs as a predella painting, and Behams made it the subject of a fine painting in the Munich Gallery. And so in many other churches and collections the Legend of the Cross appears. It is told at length in the "Vita Christa" printed at Troyes in 1517, in the "Legenda Aurea of

Jaques de Voragine;" also in an old Dutch work, "*Gerschiedenis van det Leylighe Cruys*," and in a French manuscript of the thirteenth century, now in the British Museum. It is related by Comestor, and by Gervase of Tilbury in his *Otia Imperialia*, and it also appears in the "*Speculum Historiale*," in Gottfried von Vitarbo, in which the author introduces a Hiontus (corruption for Ironicus or Ionithus) in the place of Seth. And it also occurs in "*Chronicon Engelhusii*," and in many other works.

The Legend, as current in the traditions, folklore and writings of the Middle Ages, reads as follows:

"The life of our first parents, after their expulsion from the garden of Paradise, was one of prayer, reparation for the past and toil for their daily bread at the sweat of their brows. When Adam had attained a very great age and saw that his death could not be far distant, he summoned his son Seth before him and said to him, 'Go, my son, to the terrestrial Paradise and ask the Archangel, whom you will find there guarding the gate, to give me a balsam which will prolong my years and save me from death. You cannot miss the way, for my footprints scorched the land as I was leaving Paradise and wending my way hither. You must follow my blackened traces and you will thus reach the gate from which I and your mother Eve were expelled.' The obedient Seth hastened to the closed and guarded Paradise, over lands that were barren, where vegetation was parched and sear and the color of the leaves dark and gloomy; and over this desolate way he distinctly saw the footprints of Adam and Eve as they fled before the angel of the Lord. After this arduous but not disheartening journey he arrived in sight of the walls of Paradise, and here the freshness of nature was preserved and renovated, the earth was verdant and fresh and the flowers were in bloom; the air was resonant with exquisite music and laden with refreshing odors. Dazed by the brilliancy and beauty of the scene and the sweet notes of the music he heard, Seth proceeded on his way, unmindful of his mission and of the paternal injunction. Suddenly at the gate of Paradise he was startled and stopped by the flashes of a wavering line of fire, upright and quivering continuously like a serpent. This was the flaming sword of the Cherub who stood there guarding the gates and whose wings he saw so expanded as to close the entrance. Prostrated and speechless before the Cherub, who read his thoughts and understood the message of Adam, which was engraven on his soul, Seth heard the celestial guardian of the place say to him, 'The time for pardon is not yet come. Four thousand years must roll away ere the Redeemer shall open the gate to Adam, closed by his disobedience. But as a token of future pardon, the wood whereon re-

demption shall be won shall grow from the tomb of thy father. Behold what he lost by his transgression.'

"Then the angel immediately swung open the great portal of gold and fire, and Seth, in bewilderment, looked in. Here he beheld a fountain, clear as crystal, sparkling like silver dust, playing in the midst of the garden and gushing forth in four living streams. Before this mystic fountain grew a mighty and majestic tree with a trunk of vast size and thickly branched, but destitute of bark and foliage. Around the trunk was wreathed a frightful serpent or caterpillar, which had devoured the leaves and scorched the bark. Beneath the great tree was a precipice, and Seth beheld the roots of the tree branching forth in many directions in hell. There in hell he saw Cain vainly endeavoring to grasp the roots and thus ascend to Paradise; but they laced themselves around the body and limbs of the fratricide, as the threads of a spider's web entangle a fly, and the fibres of the tree penetrated the body of Cain as though they were endued with life.

"Appalled at this horrible spectacle, Seth averted his face, and looking up he saw the summit of the tree, and here all things were changed in a moment. The tree had taken a new and sudden growth and its branches penetrated into heaven. Its boughs were covered with leaves and flowers and fruit. But the fairest fruit of all was an infant, a living sun of light and beauty, who seemed to listen to the songs of seven white doves circling around his head. A lady more beautiful than the moon lovingly bore the infant in her arms.

"Then the Cherub closed the door and said to Seth: 'I give thee now three seeds taken from that tree. When your father, Adam, is dead, place these three seeds in thy father's mouth and thus bury him.' Seth accordingly took the seeds and returned to his father, to whom he related all that he had seen and heard. Adam was glad at what he thus heard, and with much rejoicing he praised God. On the third day after, Adam, who had anticipated his death, died, and his son Seth buried him wrapped in the skins of beasts which God had given him for a covering, and his tomb was on Golgotha. The three seeds had been placed in his mouth, and in the course of time three trees grew from the seeds brought from Paradise: one was a cedar, another was a cypress and the third was a pine. They grew with marvelous strength and beauty, and their boughs extended right and left and far and near. One of these boughs formed the rod of Moses, with which he performed his miracles in Egypt, brought water from the rock and healed those whom the serpent slew in the desert.

"In time the three trees touched one another; they began to in-

corporate and unite and confound their several trunks into a single trunk. It was beneath this triple tree that King David sat when he bewailed his sins. In the time of Solomon this tree was the noblest of the trees of Lebanon; it surpassed all the trees in the forests of King Hiram, just as a monarch surpasses all those who crouch at his feet. Now, when the son of David erected his palace he cut down this tree to convert it into the main pillar supporting his roof. But it was in vain so to use it, for the column refused to be used for this purpose; it became at one time too long and at another time too short. Astonished at this resistance to his will, Solomon lowered the walls of his palace to suit the length of the beam, but the beam immediately shot up and pierced the roof of the palace, like an arrow driven through a piece of canvas or a bird recovering its liberty. Solomon, in all his wisdom, became enraged with the tree and threw it over into Cedron, that all who passed over the brook might trample upon the rebellious wood.

"In this plight the Queen of Sheba found it, and she, recognizing its virtue, had it raised, and Solomon then buried it. Some time after this the King dug the pool of Bethesda on this spot. The pool at once acquired miraculous properties and healed the sick, who flocked to it in great numbers. The waters of Bethesda owed their miraculous power to this wonderful tree.

"And now in the profound and merciful Providence of God the time of the Crucifixion of the Messiah drew near, the time of redemption foretold by the Cherub guarding the gate of Paradise, and at once the tree rose to the surface; and when the executioners of the Lamb sought for the wood that was to construct the instrument of His execution, they were guided to the spot, and selected this noted tree for the Cross of Jesus, and a Saviour died upon the wood that grew from the great tree that stood near the fountain in the Garden of Paradise."

Leaving now the realms of legend and tradition, the rest of our story of the Cross is authentic. After the Crucifixion, the Jews, fearing that the followers of Jesus might seek to possess the Cross on which He died, buried it, and then heaped a great quantity of stone and rubbish over the spot so as to conceal it, and afterwards the pagans built a temple of Venus there, so that if any found the spot and came to adore, they would, too, seem to worship the heathen goddess of love; and they also erected a statue of Jupiter there. In the year of our Lord 326, when Constantine the Great, after his conversion, resolved to build at Jerusalem a magnificent church to commemorate the death and miracles of Jesus, his mother, S. Helena, though at the age of eighty years, made the journey to Jerusalem and conceived a pious desire to find the Cross of Jesus.

But there was neither sign nor tradition to point out the spot. Upon consulting all the learned and wise ones in Jerusalem she was told that if she could find the sepulchre of Jesus, she would probably there also find the Cross and other instruments of His execution, for it was the custom of the Jews to bury those whom they executed in the same grave with the instruments of death. She therefore ordered the pagan temples to be demolished and the statues broken; the stones and rubbish were removed and the place excavated, when her piety was rewarded by the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre, and near it the three Crosses of Calvary; also the nails which had pierced the hands and feet of Jesus, the sponge and lance and the Title which had been fixed to His Cross. But the *Title* had become separated from the Cross; which of the crosses was the Cross of Jesus, and which were the crosses of the two malefactors who were crucified with Him? The holy St. Macarius recommended that the three crosses should be applied to the body of a lady of distinction then extremely ill in Jerusalem, and while this was being done he prayed to God to reward the faith and piety of the saintly and venerable Empress by permitting the sick one to be cured when the Cross of Jesus touched her body. And so it was; for after two crosses had been tried without effort, on the touch of the third cross the sick lady arose from her couch in perfect health. The grateful Empress erected upon the spot a church, and had the true Cross placed in a case of great richness and value and deposited therein. Afterwards she carried a part of the Cross to her son, the Emperor Constantine the Great, at Constantinople, who received it with great reverence; and still later she carried another part of the Cross to Rome and placed it in the Church of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem, which she built in that city and where it still remains. The *Title*, which was on wood and contained the inscription in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, was placed by her in the same church, where it was found in 1492, as related by Bosius in his treatise "*De Cruce.*" The wood was whitened and the letters were in red. That piece of the Cross which was left at Jerusalem, in the Basilica of the Holy Cross, was preserved for the veneration of the faithful, and though innumerable pieces were chipped from it, it is said never to have diminished. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, twenty-five years after its discovery by St. Helena, relates that pieces of it were spread all over the earth, and he compares its undiminished size to the miracle of the multiplied loaves and fishes in the Gospel. The relics of the Holy Cross were subsequently placed in 335 in the great Church of the Resurrection built by Constantine the Great at Jerusalem.

Chosroes II., a rude and treacherous King of Persia, waged war

against the Eastern Empire in the seventh century, and in 614 he entered Jerusalem in triumph, sacking the city and community and committing every outrage. The churches of Jerusalem were burned and plundered, and amongst the rich booty carried off by the victorious Persians was the splendid case containing the relics of the Holy Cross. The patrician Nicetas succeeded, with the help of some of the friends of Sarbazara, the Persian general, in saving the sacred sponge with which the Roman soldiers gave our Saviour vinegar to drink, and the sacred lance which pierced his side, and these were sent to Constantinople and long venerated by the faithful.

The Roman Emperor, Heraclius, defeated by the victorious Persians and reduced to an abject state, sued for peace, but such was the decline of the Roman Empire that the Persian King treated his petitions with contempt and threw his ambassadors into prison. The pagan Persian would not consent to treat with a Christian. At length the Emperor, aroused by his misfortunes and the insults he had received, resolved to defend his dominions and to carry the war into Persia. The Christian churches contributed their treasures, which were turned into coin, to enable this Christian Emperor to raise an army for the defense of Christendom. With a picture of Jesus Christ in his hands he led his army forth, and victory rested upon the Roman banners in every battle and in every campaign. Finally after repeated victories the Roman Emperor entirely overthrew the Persians in a great battle near the ancient city of Nineve, and the Persian King, the sacrilegious Chosroes, fled before the victorious Christian, and the latter returned in triumph to Constantinople, with countless prisoners and immense booty. Among the treasures which he brought back to the imperial city of the East were the relics of the true Cross, which fourteen years before Sarbazara, the Persian general, had carried away with him from Jerusalem. These precious relics were afterwards carried in person by the Emperor to Jerusalem, under the most splendid preparation made for their restoration in the basilica from which it had been taken.

The patriarch of Jerusalem, Zachary, as he walked by the side of the Emperor in this great pageant, contrasted the purple and fine linen with which his majesty was clad with the humble garb in which Jesus Christ bore the Cross through the streets of Jerusalem, and he said to Heraclius: "You walk in your gaudy imperial robes; He was meanly clad. You have on your head a rich diadem; He was crowned with a wreath of thorns. You go with your shoes on; He walked barefoot." Whereupon the Roman Emperor took off his purple robes and his crown and replaced them with the meanest clothing, and taking off his shoes, walked in the solemn and devout procession in his bare feet; and on reaching the Basilica of the

Holy Cross he solemnly and triumphantly placed the sacred relics of the Holy Cross in the place of honor from which the pagan Persians had torn them. This proud event in the history of Christendom is known as the Exaltation of the Holy Cross. The sacred relics of the Cross were subsequently, for greater safety, transferred to the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople. The feast of the Invention or Discovery of the Holy Cross is observed on the 3d of May; the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross is observed on the 14th of September.

The extent to which the miraculous multiplication of the wood of the true Cross took place, as testified by S. Syril, is not known, but the particles of this sacred relic are now possessed, though extremely minute, by many churches, religious houses and even private persons. S. Paulinus speaks of such particles or relics as a "protection of present and pledge of eternal salvation." Such relics are usually preserved in a glass like a monstrance, which is closed with the Papal or episcopal seal, and this glass is reverently kissed by the pious possessor; the relics of the Holy Cross may be placed on our altars, incensed at Solemn Mass and used for conveying blessings to the faithful and placed upon the couch of the sick and dying.

The Adoration of the Cross has from the days of Luther to our own been made the basis of a charge of idolatry against the Catholic Church. Cardinal Wiseman called it "that maligned title of '*adoration*,'" and he and Bossuet have shown that the word "*latría*," as applied to the worship of the Cross by St. Thomas, meant at that time the highest kind of worship or adoration, and philological researches have now proved that the meaning of this word has been changed since the time of St. Thomas so as to have, in the ever changing and shifting evolution of human language, quite a different meaning from what it bore at the time it was first introduced into the liturgy of the Church. Catholics, however, so thoroughly understand the nature of the veneration they pay to the Cross, and their opponents have become so much more enlightened, that it has become quite out of vogue now to accuse Catholics of idolatry because of their veneration or qualified adoration of the Cross. Archbishop Kenrick, of Baltimore, in his vindication of the Church against the charge of idolatry made by the Protestant Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, says: "The second Council of Nice, whilst approving of them, says that 'supreme worship which is according to faith, and alone becomes the Divine Nature,' must not be given to images. . . . The honor given to images is wholly referred to the objects represented by them, since in themselves they have no virtue or excellence." Then, after describing the ceremony of

Good Friday, he says: "The object of our adoration, as explained by St. Gregory, is the Saviour Himself. . . . I trust you do not deny that our Redeemer," alluding here to the custom of bowing at the name of Jesus, "even as man is rightfully worshiped on account of the union of the human nature with the Divine in the Second Divine Person. We then worship (in adoring the Cross) our Redeemer Himself, whom the image, like the sound (of the name of Jesus), presents to our mind. It has well been said by a Catholic divine that the Good Friday ceremony would be more appropriately named the kissing of the Cross."

Such, I may say, is the devotional side of the Cross. It is not strange to students of antiquity, and yet it may be to some, what a startling and curious history this sublime and cherished object of our devotions possesses. It has its devotional side and its legendary, prophetic and historical side.

The Cross has a history not unworthy of its sacred character. As American Catholics it will be a source of no slight appreciation that its history is singularly associated with the earliest religious traditions and the most ancient archæological remains of our own country. The Cross is preëminent in everything. First in our devotions, first in legend, prophecy and history.

On the 13th day of October, 1492, when Christopher Columbus and his companions landed on the continent which ultimately proved to be the virginal soil of America, the great admiral and all the world with him believed that then for the first time the foot of European man touched the Western continent. When the Cross of Christ was unfurled in the royal standard of Spain at San Salvador, the Christian priests, companions of Columbus, and all Christendom with them, believed that then for the first time was that sacred emblem ever seen in the Western Hemisphere. It then became at once the highest aspiration of layman and monk to plant the Cross in the wilderness and by it to challenge the faith of the children of the new world. Wherever the discoverer and conqueror advanced, wherever pious priest or monk penetrated the unknown world, their track was traced by the Cross they reverently elevated and planted in token of the conquest of those vast regions to the gentle yoke of Christ and His Church. Thus it was with Columbus in the West Indies, with Cortez in Mexico, with Pizarro in Peru, with all the great explorers of that day; they all gloried like St. Paul in the Redeemer's Cross. The Cross was erected at the southern and southwestern extremities of our country; by the Spanish in Florida, New Mexico and California; by the French from our northeastern boundary westward along the great northern lakes and southward through the valley of the Mississippi, until the

lengthened line of sacred emblems from the north and northeast joined the holy procession of crosses at the south; until from the St. Lawrence, along the Mississippi to the Rio Grande and Mexico, the united lines, at once sacred and historical, formed a majestic cordon of sacred emblems, a semi-circle of crosses completely surrounding the English Protestant colonies then confined to and along the Atlantic coast, with Catholic Maryland and her cross erected at St. Mary's, the cradle of religion and of liberty in America, standing in their centre, like an oasis of faith and unity in the desert of discordant creeds. Thus our country was consecrated to the Cross of Christ.

There was one striking and influential feature in all the expeditions of discovery and conquest in those days—they were all accompanied by zealous men of God; Christian missionaries were the invariable companions of great discoverers, captains and conquerors; and the mailed warriors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries advanced side by side with the black-gowned sons of the Church. Christian missions for the conversion of the almost countless tribes and peoples inhabiting the western world were commenced. The Cross was erected at every mission and was its central figure. Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuits, advancing with Cross in hand, struggled in noble rivalry to win the greatest number to the Cross and to the faith it heralded.

But now a new and astounding phase of the historic Cross in America presents itself. The Catholic missionaries were the closest observers and students of Indian customs, traditions and methods of life. Nothing so interested them as the religious condition of the Indians—their traditions, devotions, moral being and their religion. As investigators of the religions and worships of the natives they were the most thorough and untiring, for it was by their studies that they acquired a knowledge of the best means of introducing the religion of the Cross and of the Crucified. Their writings on American linguistics, ethnology and archæology, in which they have recorded their observations and studies, form a priceless legacy to the human race; and especially to the Christian philosopher and scientist they are inestimable.

What must not have been their astonishment, their amazement, at discovering that the Cross had already been introduced into America before its discovery by Columbus and before the arrival of the first Spanish Christian missionaries? What must not have been their surprise and amazement at seeing the Cross already erected on altar and carved in temple, the object of religious veneration among the natives of that new and then discovered world? The striking and expressive language in which they have recorded their

feelings at this unexpected discovery forms one of the most remarkable features in their writings.

The Spanish missionaries accompanying the discoverers and conquerors of both South and North America made similar discoveries in relation to the Cross as an object of religious worship among the aboriginal natives, and have recorded them in similar language of surprise and wonder.

The discoveries then made by the early Spanish missionaries and continued from their time by travelers, explorers and investigators, and to the present by more modern archæologists, have made known to the learned world how extensive and almost general was the recourse to the Cross as a religious emblem practiced by the people of both Americas, embracing even some few portions of our own country, but not extending to or among the warlike tribes of the North American Indians of our country and Canada, nor to the Esquimaux of the Arctic regions.

And here it will be useful and interesting to state that the different forms of the Cross are numerous. Berry in his "Encyclopædia of Heraldry" enumerates not less than 385 varieties of the Cross. In this paper it is only necessary to mention the most usual and important forms and such as will serve to illustrate our subject. The Greek Cross consists of four equal arms meeting at right angles in the centre. A variety of the Greek Cross is known as the Maltese Cross, in which the arms increase in breadth towards the ends, which terminate with double points, that is, in the shape of a Delta, or it may be an original form of Cross, for it is very ancient. In its oblique form it is designated as *crux decussata*. This form is also claimed by the Scotch as St. Andrew's Cross. St. George's Cross is a compound Cross, such as is usually represented in the British flag. It is difficult, however, to trace the history of these and other national crosses.

The Latin Cross, the one with which we are most familiar, is similar to the Greek Cross above, except that the two sides or horizontal arms are raised up nearer to the top of the vertical arm. It is called the *crux emissa*. In Zell's Encyclopædia it is called *Crux Capita*. The Latin Cross is believed to be the one upon which our Saviour was crucified.

The *Crux commissa* or *patibulata* differs from these two in having its horizontal arms shortened and resting upon the top of the vertical arms. It is also called the *tau* Cross, from its resemblance to the Greek letter tau, corresponding to our letter T. The *Crux ansata* consisted of the *Tau* Cross with a roundlet or oval on top of it, and is frequently found in ancient remains of every kind.

There are various other forms of the Cross, such as the celebrated

cruciform hammer of the Scandinavian God Thor, though the Cross of thor is usually formed *cramponnée*, — and is one of the compound crosses, of which there are several varieties, the compound crosses having been most frequently used as instruments of torture and death for the condemned among ancient nations.

The most modern forms of the Cross, though dating back to the fifth century of the Christian era, one exclusively Christian, are the two monograms of Christ which we have already described. In both South and North America, as among the Peruvians and the Mexicans, the *Crux ansata* was in very general use as an object of religion. The same may be said to some extent of the Latin Cross, or *crux emissa*, and, indeed, of many of the numerous forms of the Cross as represented in temples and altars. It was the mystical Tau, the emblem of hidden wisdom. The Muysca mothers in South America were accustomed to lay their infants beneath the Cross, trusting that by that sacred sign they would be secured against the power of evil spirits. In both North and South America the Cross was believed to be endowed with the power of restraining evil spirits. In both continents it was also the common symbol of the goddess of rain, and certain rites and ceremonies were annually performed in her honor, expressive of the religious feelings and practices of the people. Annually on the return of spring, when copious rains were needed to fertilize the land and promote the fruits of the earth, the Mexicans were accustomed to propitiate the favor of their deity, Centeotl, the daughter of heaven and goddess of corn, by nailing a young man or maiden to a Cross, and after suitable delay and suffering the victim was sacrificed to this favorite divinity by being despatched with an arrow shot from the bow. The semi-civilized Muyscas, when they desired to offer sacrifice to their goddess of the waters, extended two ropes transversely over the still waters of a lake or other body of water, thus forming a huge Cross, and at the point of intersection they threw their offerings of food, gems and precious oils.

It is also said that the tombs of the ancient Mexicans were cruciform. The Maltese cross frequently appears in the religious architecture of the same people, and of the Peruvians. Among the Mexicans the Maltese cross appears in a most elaborately carved bas-relief on a massive piece of polygonous granite, constituting a portion of a cyclopean wall, in which the cross is enclosed, and the four arms of the cross severally and accurately point to the cardinal quarters. The Maltese cross also appears in a curious Peruvian monument, an ancient huaca or catacomb, consisting of a syruix or pandean-pipe, cut out of a solid mass of lapis olaris and having its sides profusely ornamented with Maltese crosses and other emblems.

In Baradere's "Mexican Antiquities" and Rawlinson's "Five Great Monarchies" is described a still more remarkable Maltese cross, engraved on a tablet of gypsum, including, among several quaint and mystic accompaniments, a banner decorated with a large Maltese cross, resembling, no doubt, the banners borne in religious processions of Christians in our day, in which the Cross forms a prominent figure. In Peru also have been found frequent examples wrought in copper of the cruciform hammer known as the battle axe of Thor. The great work of Lord Kingsborough on the antiquities of Mexico gives numerous specimens of the same cruciform battle axe carved in the most durable rock and inserted in the exterior walls of temples and other edifices. One of the most striking and interesting instances of the use of the Cross is found in the Mexican Tribute table (Talegas), in which small pouches or bags containing the tribute paid to Montezuma, who was at once high priest and demi-god, child of the sun, divine honors having been paid to him during his life and for centuries after his death, and even to our own times. The cross, either Maltese or Latin, was conspicuously and tastefully woven or painted on these tribute bags. As this was a Pueblo tax, the custom of rendering this tribute to the sacred person of Montezuma in bags marked with the Cross probably prevailed among our own Pueblo Indians in New Mexico and others of our States or Territories acquired from Mexico.

Still another and yet more interesting and surprising form of *Cruciculus* prevailed among the tribes of South America. It gives us a proof that those superstitious and heathen people were willing to undergo the most violent pain and torture for the Cross. It consisted in tattooing their bodies with the sign of the Cross. This information I derive from the *Historical Magazine* of 1867, Vol. II., pp. 159, 160, in an article entitled "The Cross as an Ancient American Symbol," by Hon. Thomas Ewbank, who gives the following passage from "The History of the Abipones of Paraguay," by Dr. Martin Dobrizhoffer, a missionary in South America from 1749 to 1767, as follows:

"They tattoo themselves by pricking the skin with a thorn. They all wear the form of a Cross impressed on their foreheads, and two small lines at the corner of each eye, extending towards the ears, under four transverse lines at the root of the nose between the eyebrows, as national marks. . . . What these figures signify and what they portend I cannot tell, and the Abipones themselves are no better informed on the subject. They only know that this custom was handed down to them by their ancestors, and that is sufficient.

"I saw not only a cross marked on all the foreheads of the

Abipones, but also black crosses woven in the woolen garments of many. It is a very surprising circumstance that they did this before they were acquainted with the religion of Christ, when the significance and merits of the Cross were unknown to them."

The following passage from Dr. Mier as to the arrival of Quetzalcohuatl and Christian missionaries in North America will be read with interest:

"Hence (namely from the West) he came according to his history, entering California, although Torquemada says that he arrived at Tula, or Tollan, having disembarked at Panuco, some say, with fourteen and others with seven disciples, clad in long garments reaching to the feet, with tunic and Jewish mantles similar to those of the Indians, which they are accustomed to wear in their feasts. They had not with them any women, nor had Quetzalcohuatl ever any, for he was most continent. This was the great priest of Tula, and thence he sent forth his disciples to preach in Huaxyacac and other provinces a new and holy law. He demolished the idols, prohibited the sacrifices which were not of bread, flowers and incense, abhorred war, taught penance, the fast of forty or seventy days, etc."

Also a passage from Prescott, as to the return of Christian missionaries will interest our readers:

"He (Quetzalcohuatl) promised, on his departure, to return at some future day with his posterity and resume the possession of the empire. That day was looked forward to with hope or with apprehension, according to the interest of the believer, but with general confidence throughout the wide borders of Anahuac. Even after the Conquest it still lingered among the Indian races, by whom it was fondly cherished, as the advent of their king, St. Sebastian, continued to be by the Portuguese, or that of the Messiah by the Jews."

Peter Martyr also speaks of the Spaniards, in their visits to Yucatan, discovering Crosses, which were venerated as religious emblems. Boturrini also speaks of the discovery of ancient Crosses in America, one of which he found himself. He also speaks of an unpublished work entitled the "Phoenix of the West," by Don Carlos de Liguena y Gangoro, in which the author says that he possessed "a painting on linen of another most holy cross of wood, which was drawn (by means of a machine made on purpose) out of an inaccessible cave of Mixteca Baxa, and which is at present (of the time of the composition of the work) venerated in the conventual church of Tonalá, belonging to the Fathers of St. Dominick."

The learned Dr. Mier, in his supplement to Sahagun's "Conquest

of Mexico," says: "Hardly had the Spaniards approached the Continent of America, in 1519, and disembarked in Cozumel, near to Yucatan, when they found several (crosses) within and without the temples, and in one of the court-yards was an especially large one, around which it was customary for the people to go in procession when asking favors of the God. This was an especial object of veneration to the people. Crosses were also found in Yucatan, even on the breasts of the dead in the sepulchres. Hence it was that the Spaniards began to call that place New Spain."

Veytia in his "*Historia Antiqua de Mexico*" says: "Cortes found a great stone cross in a beautiful enclosure which, from the most ancient times, was adored in Acuzamil or Cozumel, and Gomara affirms that that place was regarded as the common sanctuary of all the adjacent islands, and that there was no village without its cross of stone or other material. They also found crosses in Chollolan, in Tollan, in Texcoco and other parts."

Prescott in his "*History of the Conquest of Mexico*," after speaking of the astonishment of Cortes at beholding large stone crosses, which were objects of worship, of his (in this account) calling the country New Spain, in another place says: "They (the Spaniards) could not suppress their wonder as they beheld the cross, the sacred emblem of their own faith, raised as an object of worship in the temples of Anahuac. They met with it in various places, and the image of a cross may be seen at this day sculptured in bas relief on the walls of one of the buildings of Palenque, which figure, bearing some resemblance to that of a child, is held up to it as if in adoration." The figure of the child held in the arms of a grown person, in this bas relief, has given rise to the conjecture by some that the scene represented a christening.

Father Gleason, professor at St. Mary's Catholic College, at San Francisco, in his "*History of the Catholic Church in California*," says: "What first arrested their (the Spaniards') attention . . . was the existence and frequency of the cross which met them on all sides. Everywhere throughout the entire of the Mexican Empire this symbol of our holy religion was worshiped and adored by the people. It was raised in the villages, cut on the rocks, erected on the highways and adored in the temples." The same Veytia already quoted makes the statement that "there was also a temple called the Temple of the Holy Cross, where that sacred emblem was worshiped, and what was especially deserving of attention is that this was regarded by the people as the most ancient temple of the country."

I think the "Temple of the Holy Cross" mentioned above is identical with the ancient ruin at Palenque, mentioned and described

by Stephens in his "Central America" and called by him La Cruz, The Cross. During the dreadful march of Cortes to Honduras, rendered doubly dreadful by hunger and fatigue, he did not visit the ancient city of Palenque. The Village of The Three Crosses, *Las Tres Cruces*, which was between twenty and thirty miles from Palenque, was still nearer to the course of march taken by the suffering Spanish army; but they did not turn even a few miles from their course to visit this interesting spot. The Three Crosses are said to have been near to the march of the conquerors, and to be regarded as an index or guide, to mark their course through the country.

It would be a work of cumulation only to continue to give further and numerous other instances of *Crucicultus* among the inhabitants of America at the time of its discovery by Columbus, or to multiply quotations from the numerous authors who have treated this fascinating theme. I will merely add that the voluminous and exhaustive works of Mr. Hubert Howe Bancroft, "Native Races of the Pacific States," contain much valuable and interesting learning on this subject.

But I have been anxious to discover instances of *Crucicultus* within limits of our own Republic, and for the accomplishment of this result I have examined many volumes and waded through vast fields of research. My study has happily resulted in finding two instances of religious cultus of the Cross within the present limits of our country.

The wild and fierce tribes of the red Indian found by our ancestors inhabiting this country included several successive races that in turn possessed the continent and in time gave way to other and more warlike and powerful people. A people without a history, and without even a name, are believed to have preceded our Indian tribes. From the gigantic mounds, silent monuments of their patient labor and of their faith or love of country and ancestors, which they have left behind them and which are now distinctly seen in various parts of our country, they are now universally called, for want of a better name, the Mound Builders. These vast and mysterious structures were built in some instances for military purposes and in others for religious worship. The latter class of mounds resemble in shape, structure and other features the sacred mound temples and altars, the *teocalis* of Mexico. Among the many examples we have of these temple mounds I have found one that is cruciform. It resembles the Greek cross, the four arms of which extend out from a solid central parallelogram. It is known among American archæologists as the square mound, and is to be seen to this day near Marietta, in the State of Ohio. Who can

unravel the mystery that attends this ancient and majestic monument, by which an unknown and unnamed family of the descendants of our first parents have endeavored to manifest their crude and imperfect worship of the Deity?

The second instance I have found is far more distant, more interesting and unmistakable as an instance of *Cruciculus* by the aboriginal races of our country. In 1854 the United States Government fitted out a military expedition to explore and survey a route for the Southern Pacific Railroad, and placed Lieutenant A. W. Whipple in command. Their explorations and surveys lay through New Mexico, west of the Rio Grande, between the head waters of the San Jose and Zuni Rivers. They had passed the high bluff of the El Moro of the Spaniards, and read the Spanish inscriptions and Indian hieroglyphics in the rocks, and the Pueblo ruin at Pecos, and had advanced into the country of the Old Zuni Pueblo Indians. Some of the ruins they saw were structures five stories high and holding, according to Lieutenant Whipple's estimate, two thousand people. These ancient buildings stood upon the ruins of still older structures. The origin of this semi-civilization extended back beyond the range of tradition. Near the town of old Zuni, after ascending to a high tableland, they saw the legendary statues in rock, five hundred feet high, recognized as the reputed statues of the pair that had been sacrificed at the flood. The official report states that the imagination could easily trace a resemblance in these isolated Colonies of Sacred Stone—a resemblance to human beings of colossal size, and that they were remarkable enough in appearance to perpetuate a legend among this singular people. Near this place in a secluded nook of a forest of cedars, to which his guide led Lieutenant Whipple and his other officers, a sacred spot where, within sight of one of the vast and ancient ruins already mentioned, they saw a Zuni altar. A finely drawn and colored sketch of this mysterious relic is given in the official report. Mingled with representations of the sun and moon are there seen four distinctly carved crosses, two resembling the Greek Cross, and the two others representing the *tau* Cross. In his official report Lieutenant Whipple says: "Although many seashells and other ornaments were lying around, the guide would not allow us to take away the slightest thing. When we had left he took from his pouch a white powder, and muttering a prayer blew it three times towards the altar. He then followed us, intimating by signs that upon other tablelands east, south and west, there were other similar consecrated spots. The white powder he had used we found to be *piriole*, the flower of parched corn. The object, he said, was asking a blessing from Montezuma and the sun and praying for his 'daily

bréad.'"¹ This singular and remarkable altar, with its crosses and other emblems, resembles, as beautifully represented by the fine picture in the official report, a Christian grave more than a heathen altar.

I am able to present another instance of *Crucicultus*, a singular and interesting one, at our Northeastern boundary line. It is the only example of worship of the Cross that I have been able to discover among the savage tribes of North America. When Father Christian Le Clercq, Recollet missionary, in 1673 entered upon his missionary labors among the Gaspesians, he found there a tribe of Micmac Indians who worshiped the cross in an idolatrous manner and to an excessive degree. Surrounded by other tribes who did not adopt or follow this worship in the least, this tribe of Micmacs stood isolated and alone in this remarkable practice. This region had been known to the Northmen in the tenth century. Subsequently it became the home of the good Acadians, from which they were so ruthlessly torn and still later and now known as Nova Scotia. There on the 24th of July, 1534, Cartier had planted the cross with the army of France in the Bay of Gaspé. Father Le Clercq traced the custom far back beyond the arrival of the French, discovered that the Micmacs had derived it from their ancestors and also from the Zuni, and conjectures that they may have received the Christian faith from Apostolic preachings. So much was the good Recollet impressed with the religion of the Micmacs that he called the tribe in question the Cross Bearers, or Crusaders.²

Gravier³ attributes the introduction of the religious custom of the Cross among the Micmacs to the Northmen. I will translate the following passages on this subject from Gravier:

"In the seventeenth century Christian Le Clercq, Recollet missionary, resided twelve years in Gaspesia, which became successively Acadia and Nova Scotia after having been the Markland of the Scandinavians. He then found traditions relating to the creation of man and the deluge of Noe, which seemed to be derived from Genesis.

"They possessed the worship of the cross immessa, that is to say, of the cross received by Christians towards the end of the fifth century.

"This particular concerning the form of the cross is not unimportant. If the Gaspesians had possessed the Cross in monogram, whose origin is traced from the historical times of India, or that which theologians call *commissa patibulata* or *tau*, T, which is found

¹ "Explorations and Surveys for a Railroad Route From the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean," Vol. III., p. 69.

² Le Clercq, "Reletion de la Gasperie," 1691, p. 171.

³ "Découverte de l'Amerique par les Normands au xe Siècle," pp. 170, 171.

equally in India from the most remote epoch and among Christians of the four first centuries, it would be impossible to form an opinion as to the source or date of its introduction in Northeast America. From the fact that the cross of the Gaspesians is *immissa*, or Latin, one can easily admit, on the contrary, that this people received it after the fifth century from the hands of Scandinavian priests, the only ones whose presence in America before the fifteenth century is established by authentic monuments.

"All the Gaspesians carried it figured in their clothing and upon their flesh; they had it in their hands, in all their ceremonies and in all their travels; they placed it in the exterior and in the interior of their cabins, upon their boats, even on their raquettes. They adorned the swaddling clothes of their infants, and they considered it the sign of their superiority over other nations.

"The councils of the Gaspesians were assembled around a large cross and each counselor had a small one in his hand.

"When a Gaspesian was sent as an envoy the chief solemnly passed around his neck a very beautiful cross and said to him at the end of a prepared speech: 'Go preserve this Cross, which will protect you from all dangers among those to whom we send you.'

"Women enciente wore it upon their stomachs. One fact seems above all characteristic; the Gaspesian wanted a cross upon his coffin and one upon his tomb, so that their cemeteries appeared more Christian than savage."

This was without doubt an echo from Christian preachings in America, a proof of the voyage of Erik-Upsi and of the Normans, who had their principal station, says Humboldt, at the mouth of the St. Lawrence, especially in the Bay of Gaspé, in front of the Island of Anticosti, whither abundance of fish and facilities for fishing attracted them. Father Christian Le Clercq, who derives great authority for his twelve years' sojourn at Gaspebie, also confirms this view: "In the first particular I have found among certain savages, whom we call Porte-Crosse, that there is sufficient material to cause us to conjecture and even believe that these people had not closed their ears against the voice of the Apostles." He alludes to the Christian Apostles of the Northmen.

In a later part of this paper I shall briefly consider the views of Mr. Gabriel Gravier in relation to the culture of the Cross among the Micmacs.

When the Cross was first discovered by the early Spanish priests and monks as an object of religious veneration at worship among the aborigines of America, the first sensation was one of unspeakable surprise and amazement. It was but natural that after these first sensations subsided they should address themselves to the work

of theories which presented themselves to their minds. They first conjectured that this astonishing fact was a device of the evil one. They thought that the devil, in order to divert the attention of the natives from the true faith of the Cross, and thus close their ears against the religion of Him who died upon the Cross, had fraudulently and maliciously contrived to introduce among them a false veneration of the Cross, and idolatrous cultus of the Cross, which would attach their superstitious hopes and fears to the material only of the Cross and thus discard its true virtue as the emblem of the true faith. This theory, however, in the course of time and study, gave way to another theory, one more rational and more consoling, though perhaps equally barren of solid results, and one perhaps which may not stand the test of learned research or of true historical, ecclesiastical and archæological investigation. It was certainly ingenious, it was bold and grand in its conception, and on many accounts challenging our sympathy and is entitled to grave consideration. This second theory adopted by the early Spanish monks and missionaries who accompanied the discoverers and explorers of America was that Christianity had been introduced into America at a remote period, and the Cross, though worshiped in an idolatrous manner, was a remnant of ancient Christian missions. The prevalence of the worship of the Cross was the basis of this theory, for they supposed and believed that the Cross was exclusively a Christian emblem, and its existence was an infallible proof of the existence of remnants at least of the Christian religion. The discovery, side by side with the Cross and among the same peoples, of traditions resembling and in a great measure identical with the historical accounts of Genesis relating to the creation of the world and the deluge and other Scriptural writings; the prevalence of religious beliefs, rites and ceremonies similar in a most extraordinary degree to the rites and ceremonies of the Christian religion, strengthened the argument. They discovered unmistakable traces of a belief in the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. They beheld the performance of rites resembling Christian baptism, auricular confession and the Eucharist or Lord's Supper, and they saw in existence monastic institutions of vast dimensions for monks and nuns of both sexes, the religious observance of virginity, of fasts and other means of religious self-denial. Recognizing, as they believed, in these facts unmistakable evidences or traces of Christianity, these educated and astute children of the true faith, learned churchmen and trained scholars, exhausted the traditions of the natives and the annals of Christian history for the means of solving the mystery. Several theories here presented themselves. First, that the aborigines of America were descended from some Chris-

tian people; that they brought Christianity with them to their new homes, and that its doctrines and observances had become corrupted or obscured. Second, that tenets of the Christian religion and religious observances were introduced by or learned from Christians who landed on the coast between the discovery of the country and the arrival of the Spanish missionaries. Third, that some western mariners thrown on the coast by shipwreck in storms made their homes there and imparted to the natives their knowledge of Christianity. But all those views had but slight foundations to rely upon and were soon, for obvious reasons, abandoned.⁴

Prominent among the religious observances of the Mexicans was the worship of a mythical personage whom they called Quetzalcohuatl, to whom divine honors were paid. According to tradition he was a holy personage, a white man, with a long beard, of good stature, clad in a long white robe, adorned with red crosses, barefoot, his head uncovered and with a staff in his hand. He is said to have taught his people the observance of a purer religion, and of good laws, the suppression of their unnatural passions, hatred of vice and love of virtue. It seems that it was Quetzalcohuatl who first introduced the Cross into the country as a religious emblem and object of veneration.

These facts in the religious history of Central America and Mexico, now applicable also to the States of our Confederacy, which are of Spanish and Mexican origin, led many of the monks and missionaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the conviction that the Gospel of Christ had been preached and the *cultus* of the Cross introduced into America in very remote times by Christian apostles coming from distant centres of early Christianity and in communion with Peter and his successors. These investigators turned their attention from the religious antiquities and traditions of the Americans to early Christian ecclesiastical history, and they found in St. Thomas the Apostle the probable missionary of the faith of Christ among these people, thus tracing the introduction of Christianity into America back to the first century of the Christian era, to the apostolic age and to one of the twelve Apostles. The brief period of Christian instruction which they received, and the long interval during which they were cut off from the fountain sources of Christian faith, caused the rites and doctrines of Christianity, as observed by them, to become obscured and corrupted, and the veneration of the Cross to be degraded into idolatry.

St. Thomas was selected as the Apostle who most probably evangelized America. The theory is not unsupported by a con-

⁴ "History of the Catholic Church in California," by Rev. W. Gleeson, A. M., 1872, pp. 160, 161.

siderable amount of facts, conjecture and argument. St. Thomas, having carried the faith eastward and southward into India, having been traced, in conjecture at least, by Dr. Alban Butler in his "Lives of the Saints" as far westward as the Island of Sumatra, and by Veytia in his "Ancient History of Mexico" as far as the Philippine Islands, it could not have been other than St. Thomas, Apostle of India, and now the supposed Apostle of America. So interesting is this theory that I feel that I should give it briefly, yet with a few details. And for this purpose it is but fair to give it in the very language of one of its warmest advocates in our own time, country and in his own language. I will therefore quote the following passage from "The History of the Catholic Church in California," by Rev. W. Gleeson, professor in St. Mary's Catholic College, of San Francisco, who went so far as to contend that under the command which the Saviour gave to the Apostles to "Go and preach the Gospel to all nations," they were bound to preach the Gospel in *propria persona* in America as well as in Asia, Europe and Africa; that St. Paul wrote of the Gospel as of something, to use his own words to the Colossians, "which was then actually preached in all creation that is under heaven;"⁵ and that if ocean, distance or other physical obstacles stood in the way of St. Thomas' advent to America, God would work a miracle to place him in the chosen field of his American mission. I will now quote the following passages from Father Gleeson's "History of the Catholic Church in California:—"

"It is then undeniably certain that a popular tradition existed in the minds of the people, to the effect that a venerable white man once visited the country, taught those doctrines and customs of which we have spoken, and promised one day to return with his followers. It further seems evident, from the local traditions, that this man, whoever he may have been, passed through California, Mexico, Central and a part of Southern America.

"Speaking of the traditions of Central America, in the province of Yucatan, Bishop Las Casas assures us that the natives had an idea of the principal mysteries of religion, and that these doctrines had been taught them by the person of whom we are writing. A very intelligent Indian, he says, having been questioned as to the doctrine of the people, answered that they believed in one God and three persons. To the first, whom they called Igona, was attributed the creation of all things; Bacab, the second, who was the son of Igona, was born of a virgin, Chibirias, who is now with God in heaven; while the third was Echuah. The circumstances connected with the life of the second are, in their general outline, a

⁵ Colossians, chap. 1., 5, 23.

counterpart of those as taught by the Church regarding the Redeemer. Respecting the latter part of his life the tradition was to the effect that he was made to suffer exceedingly, was cruelly scourged, crowned with thorns, put to death upon a cross, buried, rose again and ascended to his father in heaven. Then came Echuah, to fulfill or accomplish all that was to be done. This doctrine, they affirmed, had come down to them from the remotest ages, and had been taught them by men who arrived there to the number of twenty, the principal of whom was Colalcan, a venerable man with flowing beard, white robes and sandals, and who taught them to fast and confess, etc.⁶ These, and the religious customs and practices of which we have spoken before, such as baptism, penances, mortifications, continency, conventual life and especially the great feast resembling the Eucharist, are all supposed to have been introduced and established by him.

Again, on the arrival of the Dominican Fathers in Mexico, immediately after the conquest by Cortes, they found with a chief in the province of Zapotecas a symbolical writing, said to have been handed down from time immemorial, in which we are assured were contained the doctrines of the Christian religion. Father Garcia, a Franciscan, on whose authority the above has been given, further assures us that when a member of his order happened to pass through the village of Nijapa, in the province of Huaxaca, the vicar of the convent, who was a Dominican, showed him some ancient hieroglyphical writings containing all the principal doctrines of the Christian religion and the coming of the Apostle to the country.

"Taking, then, into account all the customs, traditions and practices of the people, it seems to us a most reasonable and probable opinion that the Christian religion was preached in this country long before the days of Columbus.

"What is now incumbent upon us is to show that the person, Quetzalcohuatl, who is said to have been the originator of all the doctrines and customs alluded to, was none other than the Apostle St. Thomas. For the truth of our assertion we rely in the first instance on the true significance of the name.

"On the arrival of the Spaniards in America, certain customs, practices and traditions were found to prevail, which, on any other hypothesis than that of the previous introduction of Christianity into the country, cannot be satisfactorily explained. They had nothing in common with paganism; they were not in whole or in

⁶ Veytia, "*Hist. Antiq. Mex.*"

part in harmony with it. In the Gentile mythology they were certainly out of their place. The worship of the Cross, the administration of baptism, confession and communion, though very much altered and disfigured, are yet easily recognized as being essentially Christian and not pagan. So, also, the belief in the unity and trinity of God, the incarnation, death and resurrection of Christ, which, as we have shown, appear to have been held at least by some of the people. But all these customs, practices and ideas of religion, the popular traditions of the country, as embodied in the Mexican hieroglyphics and the Peruvian Quipos, attribute to the venerable white man, Quetzalcohuatl, who, as was proved, visited the country in the year of our Lord 63, and whose name has been shown to be identical with that of the Apostle St. Thomas. When to this we add the positive statement of Scripture regarding the preaching of the Gospel in apparently every part of the world during the first age of the Christian religion, and the absence, on the other hand, of all satisfactory reason to the contrary, the reader, we feel certain, will be ready to admit that the presence of the Apostle St. Thomas in this country rests on the most reasonable and probable grounds. It commends itself, too, to our acceptance the more when we remember the field of the Apostle's missionary career in the East, he having, as it is thought, visited the Island of Sumatra⁷ and the Philippines,⁸ the direct route which, if pursued, would have brought him to the shores of the Pacific."

But it is an important part of the traditional history relating to Quetzalcohuatl, or, according to the theory we are now considering, St. Thomas, that his missionary labors were soon interrupted, his stay in the country was brief, his teachings transient, that he was expelled from the country and his companions and co-laborers in introducing the Christian faith and the Cross and the converts they made among the people were soon assimilated to and became absorbed in the mass of the population. Or, as Father Gleeson, relying upon the same tradition, and the authors he relies upon, states: "The Church in all probability was never securely established in the land. Persecution, if we may judge from the traditions, fell heavily upon it from the beginning. The saint was easily driven from the field of his labor."

We cannot but admire the learning and ingenuity displayed in support of this curious and interesting theory. But as we are historians we must view the matter from a strictly historical view, subject the claim made in behalf of St. Thomas to strict historical and archæological tests and deal and judge impartially, even though

⁷ See Butler's "Lives of the Saints."

⁸ Veytia, "Hist. Antiq. de Mejico."

our sympathies are interested. I will state the grounds upon which I am compelled to dissent from this theory, but I must state them in the briefest manner:

1. So short and transient a missionary effort could not have resulted in leaving such permanent traces behind, traces which remained so distinct for fifteen centuries.

2. The tradition itself states that the followers of Quetzalcohuatl, instead of impressing their religion upon the natives, themselves became absorbed by the natives, intermarried with them and adopted their habits and customs, and consequently their religion.

3. In Peru as well as in Mexico a similar resemblance of the religion of the natives to certain features of Christianity also existed.

4. The traditions in both countries were obscure and unreliable. Indian characters figure in the traditions of Yucatan, Peru and other countries.

5. In Peru another mythical character, founder of the religion, named Pay Suma, and known also by other names, who seems to have done for Peru what Quetzalcohuatl did for Mexico, has given rise to a similar theory, that is, that Christianity was introduced into Peru by the Apostle St. Bartholomew. Some of the Christian missionaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries also claimed that Pay Suma was St. Thomas. Both St. Thomas and St. Bartholomew have been identified with the same person, and the supposed Christian Apostle is variously represented as preaching either in North or South America, or in both continents. The names given to this demi-god in the natives' language are numerous and different, and with significations quite different from that given by the advocates of the St. Thomas theory to Quetzalcohuatl, the chief one being "the sent from God," and the "plumed serpent in the town."

6. There was a similar personage in Chili known by the name of Tonapa, which meant sage, and by other allegorical names.

7. The etymology given to the name Quetzalcohuatl is too artificial and conjectural and therefore uncertain; the only foundation for the feature of *twin* in the name is this: since the meaning of the name is claimed to be serpent, and serpents are known to bring forth two at a birth; therefore Quetzalcohuatl was a twin; St. Thomas was called Didimus the twin; therefore Quetzalcohuatl and St. Thomas were the same person. This is certainly not very logical.

8. Charlevoix, the distinguished Jesuit and historian of New France, gives but little credit to this theory.

9. The theory of St. Thomas' or St. Bartholomew's visit to America was not brought forward until a century or more after the dis-

covery of the countries in question, or of the facts in which it is bared.

10. A learned society of European antiquarians, known as the Americanistes, discredit the theory.

11. Not only were there many mythical personages in the traditions of North and South America, co-laborers or rivals of Quetzalcohuatl, but there is also a rival of St. Thomas as the first to introduce the Cross in America in the person of Fusang, a Buddhist priest, as the discoverer of America in the fifth century. Many of the difficulties in the way of the claim made for St. Thomas do not exist in the case of Fusang, for in China clear and distinct historical records have been preserved which contain accounts of his discovery and of his carrying the religion and religious practices of Buddha with him.

12. The points in which the religion of the Aztecs and Incas resembled the religion of our Saviour were less and not so striking as the resemblances their religion bore to Buddhism.⁹ The religion of Buddha also resembled that of Christ in many respects. Father Grueber and the Abbé Huc¹⁰ were surprised at the extraordinary resemblance between the religion of Buddhists and that of the Catholic Church.

13. There was no resemblance discovered in the religion of the Americans by the Spanish missionaries to the Catholic faith, which could not have been traced with greater minuteness and accuracy in the religion of the Buddhists, and the argument they drew therefrom that Christian missionaries must have preached the Gospel in America applies with greater force to the probability that Buddhists had planted their faith in America at a remote period.

14. The archæological remains in both South and North America, to which I have referred, showing the Cross to have become engraved and sculptured in the most ancient and permanent structures, would be unquestionable witnesses against tracing the origin of the religion of the Cross to so short and transient a mission as that attributed to St. Thomas. These massive and grand structures, found in both North and South America, containing examples of the Cross in permanent and colossal proportions, could only have

⁹ "Thibet, Tartary and Mingolia," by Henry T. Prensess, London, 1853, pp. 12, 55, etc.

¹⁰ "Travels in Tartary, Thibet and China," by M. Huc, London, 1852-52, Vol. I., pp. 67, 90, 123, etc.; Vol. II., pp. 32, 44, 76, etc. "Fusang; or, a Discovery of America by Chinese Buddhist Priests in the Fifth Century," by Charles G. Leland, London, 1875. *Passim*. For a more detailed statement of this subject see a learned work, singularly and unnecessarily misnamed, "An Inglorious Columbus; or, Evidence That Hwyl Shan and Party of Buddhist Monks From Afghanistan Discovered America in the Fifth Century," by Edward P. Vining, New York, 1885.

been the work of races devoted to cruciculus for long and enduring ages before their erection.

15. The chief incidents in the lives of St. Thomas and of St. Bartholomew, the Apostles, are known and have been recorded; but no reference, however slight, is made to their having gone to a distant continent across the ocean and returned, an event, if it existed, second in importance to no other achievement recorded of them. Nor is there in genuine ecclesiastical history or tradition any hint of such a voyage.¹¹

16. Considering what St. Bartholomew accomplished in the East, and St. Thomas in India, the work, and a great work, of a lifetime, there was neither time, nor opportunity, nor means, nor missionary followers at hand for them or either of them to have made such a new and pioneer voyage to America and back, for they both died in Asia. St. Thomas' grave was known to have been preserved in India and St. Bartholomew's relics are claimed to be possessed by the Christian Church.

17. The arguments drawn from the divine command to preach the Gospel to all nations and the Scriptural references to its being preached in every clime are to be construed not literally in reference to the former, not historically in reference to the latter; but these rather related dogmatically to one of the marks of the true Church, its *Universality*. The same texts would apply with equal force to Northern Europe and to Scandinavia, which were not converted to Christianity until the tenth and subsequent centuries; and they apply also and equally to our savage North American Indians, who avowedly were embraced in the alleged Christian mission of St. Thomas.

18. There is another and more ancient origin for the facts seen and reported by the Christian missionaries in America in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than any possible mission of St. Thomas or of St. Bartholomew. Those pious and zealous men of God, in common with Christian scholars of their day, supposed and believed that the Cross was exclusively a Christian emblem. They believed that the existence among any people of Cruciculus was an infallible proof of previous Christian teaching and of the prevalence of Christianity among them. The researches, however, of antiquarians, modern archæologists and historians disclosed the fact that the *cultus* of the Cross, cruciculus, existed from the most remote antiquity and among most and nearly all of the civilized nations of the world. It formed a part of the religion of almost every known people of culture on the face of the earth; so general, so almost uni-

¹¹ Charlevoix, "New France," Vol. II., p. 274. "Congress International des Americanistes," *Compte-Rendu de la Seconde Session*, Vol. I., p. 363.

versal has the Cross been religiously venerated among nations and peoples that the most learned had at first regarded it as a mystery beyond human explanation, and numerous have been the ingenious and learned theories invented to explain it. If the religious veneration of the Cross in ancient Egypt, India, China, in ancient Europe from Italy to Scandinavia on the north, and on the south Kamptchatska, did not prove that these countries had been evangelized for Christ, the existence of the same religious features in the *cultus* of the Americans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries would not prove that America had been evangelized by Christian missionaries from those countries. If the Cross, as now proved by the most undoubted results of researches of learned men and scholars of every creed and faith and of every nation, was not exclusively a Christian emblem, but was common to many ancient creeds and prevalent among many ancient nations and peoples, then the prevalence or existence of cruciculus in America in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries does not prove that America had been evangelized by Christians. Not only was the Cross not exclusively a Christian emblem, but it is equally certain that its religious and sacred character was recognized in pre-Christian ages, indeed from the most remote antiquity. So that the source from which the natives of America in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries derived the Cross as well as religious observances and beliefs in great numbers and varieties is as much a matter of curious conjecture and learned discussion as is the unanswered question, *From what source have the aborigines of America sprung?*¹²

The following suggestive views from a learned critic and investigator will stimulate intelligent further inquiry:

"For my part I see no difficulty in believing that it formed a part of the primeval religion, traces of which exist over the whole world, among every people; that trust in the Cross was a part of the ancient faith which taught men to believe in a trinity, in a war in heaven, a Paradise from which man fell and a Babel; a faith which was deeply impressed with a conviction that a virgin should conceive and bear a son; that the dragon's head should be bruised, and that through shedding of blood should come redemption. The use of the Cross, as a symbol of life and resurrection through water, is as widely spread over the world as the belief in the Ark of Noah. Maybe the shadow of the Cross was cast further back into the night of ages, and fell on a wider range of country than we are aware of.

¹² For worship of the Cross amongst the Egyptians and other nations, see Lipsius "De Cruce," Humboldt, "Geographie du Nouveau Continent;" "Curious Myths of the Middle Ages," by S. Baring Gould, second series; "The Cross and the Serpent," by Rev. William Haslam; *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1870, title, "Pre-Christian Cross;" Lord Kingsborough's "Mexican Antiquities."

"It is more than a coincidence that Osiris by the Cross should give life eternal to the spirits of the just; that with the Cross Thor should smite the head of the great serpent and bring to life those that were slain; that beneath the Cross the Muysca mothers should lay their babes, trusting by that sign to secure them from the power of the evil spirit; that with this symbol to protect them the ancient people of Northern Italy should lay them down in the dust."

To within not many years ago one of the devotions of the Church in vogue among Catholics and contained in our prayer books, but now allowed only as a private devotion and not in our public services, was the beautiful Litany of the Holy Cross. I have already mentioned the Catholic Pilgrims of Maryland, who, on the feast of the Annunciation, March 25, 1633, after calling their settlement St. Mary's and celebrating the first Mass in that part of the country, proceeded to hew down a huge tree, with which they formed a Cross and carried it in procession to the spot where it was erected, and with it, as the Jesuit Father Andrew White states in his "Relation of Maryland," "We erected a trophy to Christ the Saviour, humbly reciting on our bended knees the Litanies of the Sacred Cross with great emotion." The prayers of this interesting litany were addressed through the Cross to Him who died thereon, and although the Catholic Pilgrims chanted "Holy Cross, whereon the Lamb of God was offered for the sins of the world, deliver and save us," it was the Lamb Himself whom they thus addressed. I give in full the petitions of this devout litany as it is not now in our prayer books, in order to show by what endearing titles the Cross is addressed as a vehicle of our prayers to heaven, titles which are herein above verified by cited legends, traditions, prophecies and histories and by American antiquarian researches:

| | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Help of Christians, Pledge of the resurrection from the dead, Shelter of persecuted innocence, Guide of the blind, Way of those who have gone astray, Star of the mariner, Harbor of the wrecked, Rampart of the besieged, Father of orphans, Defense of widows, Counsel of the just, Judge of the wicked, Rest of the afflicted, Safeguard of childhood, Strength of manhood, Last hope of the aged, Light of those who sit in darkness, Splendor of kings, Civilizer of the world, Destruction of idolatry, | Save us, O Holy Cross! | Staff of the lame, Consolation of the poor, Refuge of sinners, Trophy of victory over hell, Terror of demons, Mistress of youth, Succor of the distressed, Hope of the hopeless, Buckler impenetrable, Wisdom of the foolish, Liberty of slaves, Knowledge of the ignorant, Sure rule of life, Heralded by prophets, Preached by apostles, Glory of martyrs, Study of anchorites, Chastity of virgins, Joy of priests, Foundation of the church, Salvation of the world, | Save us, O Holy Cross! |
|--|------------------------|--|------------------------|

While thus reviving the unparalleled record and titles of the

Tree of the Cross and its celestial fruits harvested on earth, we must be struck with the contrast this illustrious tree bears to the humble yet beautiful though sad fate of the natural tree of earthly forests. A new and beautiful poem, by Edna Kingsley Wallace, at this moment meets the eye and heightens the contrast between the Litany of the Holy Cross, Tree of the Cross and

"THE SONG OF THE TREE."

Warm in the deep of the prison of sleep,
I lay in the womb of the Earth,
Till the Spirit of God in the tingling sod
Aroused my spirit to birth.
Then fed by the dew and the sun I grew
From a sapling-hood to a Tree,
As tall and elate, as strong and as straight,
As ever a Tree should be.

Now, robed in a sheen of shimmering green,
Bathed in the sunrise red,
My branches glisten, my little leaves listen
For secrets that never were said;
Though the sunshine glint, and the west wind hint,
And the raindrops murmur, I wean
Man never shall learn, nor a Tree discern,
The ultimate thing they mean.

Or stripped to the chill of the north wind's will,
I stand in my strong bare bones;
I dance with the blast as maddening past
The tempests in anguish moans.
With strife and song my spirit grows strong,
In the law of my being I grow,
Till the lightning smite, or the wind in its might,
The growth of the years o'erthrow.

And when long I have lain in the sun and the rain,
And the creeping things grow bolder,
And Earth, my mother, makes Dust, my brother,
As into the ground I moulder,
Then out of my death shall arise the breath
Of flowers of rainbow hues,
So, welcome my life, with its growth and its strife,
Then—Death be the Life I choose!

In this poetic song we perceive that the tree greets and welcomes death, claiming as its only privilege that from the rich mould of its decaying members, mingling with the earth, there might spring the transient wild flowers of the woods, whose beauty fades at the touch and whose life is extinguished with the frost.

But the Tree of the Cross, springing from the seeds taken from the great tree that grew beside the fountain in the Garden of Paradise, is perennial in its inextinguishable life and eternal fruits. It has proved itself the "Help of Christians" and the "Salvation of the World." Its precious fruits are laid before Christian eyes in the books of devotion, but, alas! so seldom do they penetrate the soul, guide the daily conduct and chasten the Christian to the spiritual combat of life! Beautiful as their recital is in a literary point of view as enhancing the Legend of the Cross, it is still more resplendent in the sweet fruits of the soul flowing from the Tree. Then

let us recite them for the soul's reminder. The flowers and fruits of Holy Cross:

The Three Theological Virtues: Faith, Hope and Charity.

The Four Cardinal Virtues: Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, Temperance.

Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost: Wisdom, Understanding, Counsel, Fortitude, Knowledge, Piety, The Fear of the Lord.

Twelve Fruits of the Holy Ghost: Charity, Joy, Peace, Patience, Benignity, Goodness, Long-suffering, Mildness, Faith, Modesty, Continency, Chastity.

Spiritual Works of Mercy:

To admonish the sinner.

To instruct the ignorant.

To counsel the doubtful.

To comfort the sorrowful.

To bear wrongs patiently.

To forgive all injuries.

To pray for the living and the dead.

The Corporal Works of Mercy: To feed the hungry, to give drink to the thirsty, to clothe the naked, to ransom the captive, to harbor the harborless, to visit the sick, to bury the dead.

The Eight Beatitudes: 1. Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. 2. Blessed are the meek, for they shall possess the land. 3. Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted. 4. Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice, for they shall be filled. 5. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. 6. Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God. 7. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God. 8. Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice's sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Three eminent good works: Prayer, Fasting, Almsgiving.

The Evangelical Counsels: Voluntary Poverty, Chastity, Obedience.

Having given "The Song of the Tree" in the natural order, let us now recall only a few verses from the pathetic hymns, "Crux Fidelis" and "Pange, Lingua," which are chanted in our churches at the procession and kissing of the Cross on Good Friday, using therefor the English translation made by an eminent American prelate, the late Bishop England, of Charleston:

Faithful Cross, O tree all beauteous,
Tree all peerless and divine!
Not a grove on earth can show us
Such a flower and leaf as thine.
Sweet the nails and sweet the wood,
Laden with so sweet a load.
Lofty tree, bend down thy branches,
To embrace thy sacred load;

Oh, relax the native tension
 Of that all too rigid wood;
 Gently, gently bear the members
 Of the dying King and God.
 Sweet the nails and sweet the wood,
 Laden with so sweet a load.
 Tree, which solely was found worthy
 The world's great Victim to sustain;
 Harbor from the raging tempest!
 Ark, that sav'd the world again!
 Tree with sacred Blood anointed
 Of the Lamb for sinners slain.
 Faithful Cross, O tree all beauteous,
 Tree all peerless and divine,
 Not a grove on earth can show us
 Such a flower and leaf as thine.

Having in our title spoken of the Cross in the light of prophesy, it seems but meet to present a passage from "The Catechism of the Council of Trent," published years ago by command of Pope Pius V. ("Composed by decree of the Council of Trent, and the same venerable authority commands all Bishops 'to take care that it be faithfully translated into the vernacular language and expounded to the people by all pastors.'") to show some of the ancient types by which the Cross of Calvary was predicted:

Knowing therefore that nothing is so far above the reach of human reason as the mystery of the Cross, Almighty God, immediately from the fall of Adam, ceased not, both by figures and by the oracles of the prophets, to signify the death by which His Son was to die. Not to dwell on these figures, Abel, who fell a victim to the envy of his brother (Gen. ii., 8), Isaac, who was commanded to be offered in sacrifice (Gen. xxii., 6, 7, 8), the Lamb immolated by the Jews on their departure from Egypt (Exod. xi., 5, 6, 7), and also the brazen serpent lifted up by Moses in the desert (Num. xxi., 8, 9) were all figures of the passion and death of Christ the Lord. That this event was foretold by many prophets is a fact too well known to require development here. Not to speak of David, whose psalms embrace the principal mysteries of redemption (Psalm ii., xxi., xvi., cix.); the oracles of Isaias are so clear and graphic (Isai. i., 3) that he may be said rather to have recorded a past than predicted a future event. (Hier. Epist. ad Paulin. ante finem.)

But the prophetic Cross is further announced to us in the liturgy of the Church itself, and for this purpose I cite another verse from the "Pange, Lingua:"

Eating of the tree forbidden,
 Man had sunk in Satan's snare,
 When our pitying Creator
 Did this second Tree prepare;
 Destin'd many ages later,
 That first evil to repair.

Allusion having been made in the passage above from the "Catechism of the Council of Trent" to the prophetic Psalms ii., xxi., lxvi., clx. of David, it will prove a pleasing conclusion to our paper to recall the recognition of these prophecies by reciting the following beautiful verse from the "Vexilla Regis:"

O Sacred Wood! in thee fulfilled
 Was holy David's truthful lay,
 Which told the world that from a tree
 The Lord should all the nations sway.

RICHARD H. CLARKE.

CLEMENT VII., CAMPEGGIO AND THE DIVORCE.

THAT the beginnings of Protestantism in the English-speaking countries of the world must be traced to the nullity suit commonly called the "Divorce," by which Henry VIII. sought to release himself from his marriage vows, is a fact too patent to be called in question; and it is not wonderful that during the last thirty years no incident of English history has been more thoroughly investigated. Professor Brewer, Mr. Pocock, Mr. Paul Friedmann, Canon Dixon, and above all, Dr. James Gairdner¹ have all made valuable contributions to our knowledge of the subject. Neither has the interest in this episode been confined to England alone. Though Dr. Busch has made no progress with his History of England under the Tudors, there is evidence of careful study of the Divorce in his articles in the "*Historisches Taschenbuch*."² Still more, an accomplished Catholic ecclesiastic, Dr. Stephen Ehses, availing himself of the facilities for research afforded by the throwing open of the Vatican archives, has published a volume of documents of first-rate importance which have shed a much needed light on the many obscure points of the story.³ It is strange that the work of Dr. Ehses has not attracted more attention among those whom his discoveries more immediately concern. With the exception of the generous tribute paid by Dr. Gairdner in the articles already mentioned, little notice has been taken elsewhere of these new and valuable Roman documents. Perhaps this fact may serve as a sufficient excuse for referring to them frequently in the following pages. My principal object, however, in the present article is not so much to analyze the work of Dr. Ehses as to protest against the rather serious misrepresentations, as they appear to me, of certain recent critics⁴ of Pope Clement, who find but little to con-

¹ Apart from the large share taken by Dr. Gairdner in the editing of the Calendars, I refer particularly to his three admirable articles in the *English Historical Review* (1896-1897), "New Lights on the Divorce of Henry VIII.," the substance of which he has also digested in his "History of the English Church During the Tudor Period."

² In the years 1889, 1890. See also his separate brochure "Der Sturz von Wolsey."

³ *Römische Dokumente zur Geschichte der Ghescheidung Heinrichs VIII. von England*, Paderborn, 1893. See also the articles by the same writer in the *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 1888 and 1892, and a newly discovered letter of Campeggio's published by him subsequently in the *Römische Quartalschrift*, 1900.

⁴ I refer particularly to the monograph on "Henry VIII." by Mr. A. F. Pollard, a magnificently illustrated work which appeared in 1902, and to "Thomas Wolsey, Legate and Reformer," by Father Ethelred Taunton, published in the same year. The fact that the latter claims in his Preface to have shed new light on the divorce question seems to throw down the gauntlet to those who hitherto, with Lingard and Brewer, Gairdner and Ehses, have read the facts very differently.

demn in all the negotiations for the Divorce except "the Italian shiftiness and Spanish terrorism" by which these proceedings were brought to naught.

Let me begin with a point which though but remotely connected with Clement VII. has an important bearing on other facts, and is made very clear in the preface of Dr. Ehses' volume. It will be remembered that over and above the *bull* of dispensation which was unquestionably granted by Julius II. authorizing Henry to marry his brother's widow, there was suddenly produced in the course of the divorce proceedings a second dispensation, in the form of a *brief*, bearing the same date as the bull (*i. e.*, December 26, 1503,) and differing from it in some details then considered to be of moment. One such detail was the fact that the brief formally stated that the marriage between Arthur and Catherine had been consummated, whereas the bull by inserting the word "perhaps" (*forsan consummavissetis*) left the matter in uncertainty. The authenticity of the brief was clamorously denied in 1529 by Henry and his agents for interested motives, but the almost unanimous⁵ verdict of modern historians has been that while the marriage with Arthur was certainly not consummated, the dispensation brief, on the other hand, which took the consummation for granted, was a perfectly genuine document.

In spite, however, of this consensus of opinion, a recent Catholic apologist of Cardinal Wolsey, after very brief discussion, has assumed the contradictory of both these propositions, for no better reason, his readers will suspect, than that this was the story told by Wolsey's Spanish adversaries, and that the story, being Spanish, was likely to be false. It may be instructive before proceeding further to glance for a moment at the evidence.

Prince Arthur, then just 15 years of age, but notoriously in feeble health, was married to Catherine of Arragon, herself not quite 16, in November, 1501, and the union terminated five months afterwards by the death of the prince on April 2, 1502. The fact that this marriage was never consummated has, as just observed, been almost universally admitted. Even the staunchest adherents of the Reformation pay tribute to the high moral principle of Queen Catherine, and it is certain that she repeatedly testified upon oath, and in the most solemn terms that she was still a virgin when she became the bride of Henry. If this circumstance had only been heard of for the first time when the divorce proceedings of 1528 threatened

⁵ Apart from Mr. Froude, whose paradoxes nobody takes seriously, the only dissentient seems to be the writer of an article in the *QUARTERLY REVIEW* for 1877, said to be Lord Acton. But Lord Acton has been elaborately refuted by Mr. Paul Friedmann, and besides this, many facts have since come to light which were not known in 1877.

the Queen with repudiation, and her daughter with illegitimacy, we might have felt a momentary hesitation in accepting Catherine's protestations. But long before the union with Henry took place it was widely known both in Spain and England that the former marriage had been a marriage only in name; so much so, that in celebrating her second nuptials, in 1509, Catherine was dressed in white and wore her hair loose, peculiarities of costume which were then distinctive of maidens and denied to widows. Moreover, the Queen always appealed to Henry's own knowledge of the truth, and this appeal he never dared to meet by any formal contradiction, much less by his testimony upon oath. Under these circumstances it is strange that the writer just referred to should still treat the consummation as an open question, ignoring all that has been written by men like Brewer, Gairdner, Pocock, Lingard, Friedmann, Ehse, Busch and many others. Catherine was not, perhaps, faultless, but she was an honorable Christian lady, hitherto deemed worthy of all respect, and it is not pleasant to think of her not only as trebly perjured, but even as going out of her way to make a mockery of the sacraments, as this hypothesis seems necessarily to suppose, in order to gain the legate to her side.⁶

But though no doubt can be felt that Catherine's earlier marriage was not in fact consummated, it is certain that the Papal dispensation which enabled her to wed the brother of her late husband was granted quite independently of this circumstance. The docu-

⁶ All the fresh evidence bearing on this matter which has been brought to light in our own day tends to confirm Catherine's statement. Much has been made in the opposite sense of a letter of Henry VII. published by the Duke of Manchester in his book, "Court and Society From Elizabeth to Anne" (Vol. I., p. 59), wherein Henry testifies that though he feared for Arthur's weak health, he had thought it best that the young bride and bridegroom should be allowed to set up house together. But this fact has never for a moment been in dispute. Catherine in making her story known to Cardinal Campeggio, under seal of confession, told him that though on some seven or eight different occasions Arthur had shared her room "da lui restò intacta et incorrupta come venne del ventre di sua madre," giving him leave to communicate these facts to the Pope. The evidence adduced at the trial against Catherine's allegation proved indeed that the young couple lived together, but was otherwise of the flimsiest character, whereas nothing could be more convincing than the summary of arguments drawn up on the other side, which has been recently brought to light by Ehse (*Römische Dokumente*," pp. 215-221). Again, the Spanish testimonies of 1502-3 bear every mark both of intrinsic probability and accurate information. (See Bergenroth, "Spanish Calendar," I., n. n. 325, 327 and 370, and p. xc....) It was no less a person than Doña Elbira, first Woman of the Bedchamber to Catherine, who, before July 12, 1502, sent word to Spain that the marriage had never been consummated. There is also evidence for the supposition (though on this particular point Dr. Busch dissents) that after Arthur's death Henry VII. thought of marrying Catherine himself. It is incredible that he could have proposed this, had she ever in a true sense been his son's wife.

ment—I am now referring only to the *bull*—has been printed a dozen times. Not only does the preliminary statement assert that the marriage between Arthur and Catherine took place and was “perhaps consummated,” but the dispensation is formally granted to remedy the impediment of *affinity*, an impediment of which, as Dr. Ehses has pointed out,⁷ there could not be question if Arthur and Catherine had never really lived in a marital relation. To say the truth, Wolsey was probably right in thinking that the best legal ground for contesting the validity of the dispensation would have been to urge that the impediment which really existed was one of *publica honestas*, while that which the bull contemplated was one of *affinitas*; from which it would seem to follow that the dispensation did not meet the case and was consequently of no avail.⁸

But here, for the sake of my untheological readers, a few words of explanation may be desirable even at the risk of a digression. If a man contract with a woman, either by formal betrothal or by actual matrimony, there is created between him and her near relatives (and the same, of course, is true for her, with regard to *his* near relatives) a diriment impediment which is known as that of public honesty (*publicae honestatis justicia*). Such formal betrothal contracts (*sponsalia*) hardly exist now, but they were common once. If, after such a betrothal or marriage, the woman died, or changed her mind and married some one else, then the man would not be free to wed the sister or the daughter of his former fiancée without a special dispensation releasing him from this impediment of “public honesty.” If he attempted to do so without a dispensation, the marriage in the eyes of the Church would not be valid. Suppose, however, that a man establish relations with a woman not by mere verbal agreement, but by carnal intercourse, licit or illicit, that is, whether she be married to him or not, then there is created between him and her near relatives a diriment impediment of *affinity*. If he wanted to marry her sister or niece, etc., it would be necessary, under the same penalty of invalidity, to obtain a dispensation removing this impediment. Now, if between an intending bride and bridegroom there existed the impediment of affinity, and through some error a dispensation was obtained, not for affinity, but for public honesty, the marriage, ordinarily speaking, would not be valid. For

⁷ “Römische Dokumente,” Preface, p. xxxii.

⁸ It seems worth while to call special attention to this, as in a recently published School History of England the statement is made that “the Papal dispensation which enabled Henry VIII. to marry his brother’s widow had been obtained on the understanding that the former marriage (with Arthur) had never been consummated.” “Lingard’s History of England Abridged,” by Dom. N. Birt, with a Preface by Abbot Gasquet, 1903. Now, I cannot find any such statement in Lingard, and even if Lingard had made it, the statement would surely be quite erroneous.

affinity is a much more serious bar to union than public honesty, something quite different in its nature and not so readily dispensed. If, however, owing to non-consummation of a reputed marriage, a dispensation from affinity were in good faith asked for, where only one from public honesty was needed, then, if the relation of the parties were clearly explained in the document, there can be no doubt that the dispensation from affinity would nowadays be held to cover the other. And the same would be true if both affinity and public honesty concurred in the same case; for when it is stated that a man wishes to marry his brother's widow, it is obvious that there must exist the impediment of public honesty over and above the affinity which is directly dispensed from. If any one will study the opinions of the canonists of that age (I might mention the "*Rosella Casuum*," 1482, etc., as one of the most popular books of the kind, and typical of the rest) he will not, I think, feel the slightest doubt that the question would in the long run have been decided by canon lawyers then exactly as it would be decided at the present day.⁹

Now, if Cardinal Wolsey had been left to himself this difficulty about *publica honestas* would, I think, very probably have been urged by him as likely best to serve his master's interest in pressing for the divorce.¹⁰ But he was not left to himself. The plea of a wrong dispensation, which would have been serious and respectable as long as it was admitted that there had been no consummation in the first marriage and consequently no affinity, degenerated into a mere quibble if it was at the same time pretended that there *had been* consummation. But this was a point Henry would not surrender. He was a theologian, too, and from the very beginning his pet theory had

⁹ Moreover, as Dr. Ehses again irresistibly argues, when we note the actual wording of the bull of Julius, we see that it is meant to be a great deal more than a mere formal release from the impediment of affinity. The insertion of the words "*perhaps consummated*" are tantamount to a concession of that form of dispensation which would necessarily be required if the doubt suggested were well founded; and there are also other general clauses added. The essential words are: "*Cum matrimonium contraxissetis—Catherine and Arthur—illudque carnali copula forsan consummavissetis—nos vobiscum—Henry and Catherine—ut impedimento affinitatis huiusmodi ex præmissio proveniente ac constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis cæterisque contrariis nequaquam obstantibus matrimonium inter vos contrahere et in eo licite remanere valeatis dispensamus.*"

¹⁰ See Wolsey's letter to the King, July 1, 1527; "*State Papers*," I., p. 194. I am glad upon this point to find myself in agreement with Father Taunton (l. c., p. 181). The difficulty seems to me to have been clearly foreseen on the other side. Mendoza, the Spanish Ambassador in London, writes to his own court that it was not considered advisable for Queen Catherine to lay stress upon the fact of the non-consummation of the first marriage ("*Spanish Calendar*," Vol. III., Part 2, pp. 819 and 843). This, I fancy, must have been the reason why she communicated the fact to Campeggio under seal of confession.

been that marriage with a deceased brother's widow was forbidden *jure divino*, and could not be rendered possible by any Papal dispensation.¹¹ But this, of course, as his own supporters admitted, assumed that the former marriage was a marriage in the full and most complete sense, not only *ratum* but *consummatum*. At the beginning, when Henry still hoped to gain the Pope to his side by fair words, he dared not insist upon this pet theory of his, for fear of giving offense. To ask the Pope to declare that his predecessors had sanctioned the violation of the natural law and had issued dispensations in matters which were altogether beyond their competence, would not have been a very diplomatic step. None the less, this objection remained throughout at the back of Henry's mind, and he would never admit for a moment that the first marriage had not been consummated, for this would have cut him off from employing the objection later on. The result was that neither Wolsey's difficulty on the score of *publica honestas* nor the King's theory that marriage with a deceased brother's widow was beyond the Pope's power to dispense, actually figured in the English case as first presented to the Roman Court. We have the fullest knowledge from half a dozen different sources of the arguments which actually were used,¹² and neither of these points is mentioned. I insist upon this because Father Taunton has declared that "*the case as put by Wolsey*"—he means the contention that the dispensation bull was invalid because it made no mention of the impediment of *publica honestas*—was perfectly just, and that the Pope in resisting Henry's claim was deliberately refusing what he knew that equity required! But nothing can be more certain than that at this stage of the proceedings, *i. e.*, until the cause was revoked and Campeggio had left England, the arguments used were of an entirely different

¹¹ This is the point upon which stress is laid in the collusive suit before Wolsey and Warham in May, 1527: "quoniam aliquorum opinione jure divino (eius modi matrimonia) ecclesiasticis constitutionibus prohibentur omnino," "Letters and Papers Henry VIII.," iv., p. 1427. This was also the question submitted to Fisher June 2, 1527 (*ib.*, n. 3148). This was the statement made by Henry to Catherine on June 22 ("Gayangos," III, 2, p. 276), and this, of course, later on was the question which Henry submitted to the Universities, and to which, owing, as is not now disputed, to systematic bribery, he obtained so many favorable answers.

¹² Ehses gives two papers summarizing these reasons. See "Römische Dokumente," pp. 21 and 158. Dr. Gairdner has translated the first of these sets in the *English Historical Review*, 1897, p. 689. Then we have three drafts of the Decretal Commission which sets forth the reasons for rejecting the dispensation bull at length. See, for instance, Pocock "Records," Vol. I.; "Burnet" (Ed. Pocock), Vol. IV., p. 49. Then we have Wolsey's full instructions to Gregory Casale Calendar, IV., p. 1638, and Burnet, IV., p. 21; and more particularly a document, 16, p. 77, where though the impediment of *publicæ honestatis iusticia* is mentioned at the beginning, not the least use is made of it as an argument against the bull.

character. It was only later on, when Henry cared little whether he offended the Pope or not, that the limitations of the Papal dispensing power appear prominently upon the scene, and with that, though even then in a very subordinate position, the difficulty raised by Wolsey concerning *publica honestas* was revived.

Regarding the arguments which actually were used by the King's advisers in 1528 and 1529 I do not propose to speak at any length.¹³ They turned upon the supposed misrepresentations and inadequacy of the motives alleged for granting the dispensation, and they were perhaps the most respectable legal pretexts that could be found under the circumstances, but even an extravagant partisan could hardly describe them as more than pretexts. The difficulty is rather to see how Clement was justified in granting a legatine commission to inquire into them at all. It is not a little startling, then, to meet, in the author just referred to, with such expressions of opinion as the following:

"Clement had from the master mind of England (Wolsey) full knowledge of what the results would be if he denied justice (*i. e.*, refused the divorce); but the Spaniard was an ever present and pressing fear."¹⁴

Or again:

"Clement said, weeping, it would be his ruin to grant the commission. It is, indeed, a pitiful sight to see the Pontiff involved in the clouds of these considerations through which the light of Eternal Justice did not seem to pierce."¹⁵

Or again:

"Clement knew that his motives (for refusing to pronounce the dispensation of Julius invalid) would not bear scrutiny, and he tried to avoid public odium by a characteristic subterfuge."¹⁶

Or to quote a passage to which I have already alluded:

"To while away the time, and to keep up the appearance of friendship, Clement sent dispensations and commissions which were of no good, and made all sorts of suggestions to escape the dilemma. He knew that if he inquired into the case, *as put by Wolsey*, justice, based on his own laws, would probably demand a verdict for the King; but this could only be at the expense of the favor of Charles."¹⁷

What is here described as an appeal for justice is commonly denounced by sober and moderate writers like Mr. Brewer¹⁸ and

¹³ I hope to deal with the "decretal commission" which embodied these arguments and the dispensation brief more at length elsewhere.

¹⁴ "Thomas Wolsey, Legate and Reformer," p. 199.

¹⁵ *Ib.*, p. 190.

¹⁶ *Ib.*, p. 160.

¹⁷ *P.* 188.

¹⁸ Here, for instance, are a few remarks of Mr. Brewer's which I quote for

Dr. Gairdner as an unscrupulous attempt to set right and morality at defiance. Of course, Mr. Brewer and Dr. Gairdner may be wrong, but does their opponent show that he possesses such a mastery of the facts as would justify us in taking his word against the opinion of men who have given their lives to the study of this period? I confess I am very far from finding that mastery of the facts in the volume referred to. Let me give a single illustration.

The question of the dispensation *brief* of Julius, which on its production in 1528 brought the Divorce proceedings to a standstill, has already been alluded to. Ignoring the results of recent research,¹⁹ the writer with whom we are concerned pronounces it to be a spurious document. As to this, of course, no one would contest his right to form his own opinion. But he sums up his indictment in the following words:

"The manifest occasions which the defects of this Brief gave for suspicion as to its genuineness were further increased when Wolsey learnt that at Rome no trace of such an important document could be found, and that Charles persistently refused to produce the original. Clement himself was obliged to write to Campeggio that he authorized him to reject whatever evidence was tendered on behalf of this Brief as being an evident forgery."

For this last statement a reference is given to Pocock, "Records," I., p. 184, and if the reader looks up the document in question he will find himself confronted, as indeed Mr. Pocock's heading plainly states, with a Draft Commission²⁰ prepared in England for Clement's signature, in the hope that he could be bullied into accepting it, but with which we know that he refused to have anything to do. Almost every word in this instrument is contradicted by what we learn from the despatches of the English envoys themselves. It can no more be quoted as representing Clement's views about the brief than a rejected bill before any legislature can be quoted as repre-

poses of comparison: "Never was a more extravagant demand made on any Pope's good nature, and never was a stranger proposal submitted to the highest spiritual authority of Christendom. A man even of less firmness than Clement VII., and less regard for justice, would have resented a suggestion that he should abdicate his functions of supreme judge and lend himself a willing and unresisting victim to such a gross act of injustice." Brewer, "Henry VIII.," Vol. II., p. 236. And Dr. Gairdner speaks of "the crooked paths through which Henry had hitherto pursued his object (the divorce), and the shameful mendacity with which he himself (i. e. Wolsey) had backed it up." *English Historical Review*, 1897, p. 4.

¹⁹ Busch, "England Under the Tudors," Vol. I., p. 377, says: "Each additional contribution to the history of the brief makes its genuineness seem more unassailable." Since this was written Dr. Eshes has added considerably to the strength of the arguments in its favor. See "Römische Dokumente," pp. xxxi.-xliii.

²⁰ "Draft of a Decretal Commission by which the Pope was intended to declare the Breve to be false." Pocock, I., 184.

senting the laws of the country. Father Taunton has forgotten an impressive warning more than once repeated by Mr. Brewer :

"It is necessary that the historical student should beware of a very common blunder, into which many writers have fallen, of treating documents thus prepared in England for the Pope's adoption as if they had emanated from the Pope himself."²¹

Assuming, then, that in resisting the demands of Henry VIII. Pope Clement was, materially at least, promoting the cause of justice, the question remains whether he was to any appreciable extent acting from principle or whether he was simply the feeble tool of the Emperor, Catherine's nephew. That the Pope represented an heroic type of integrity, *justum et tenacem propositi virum*, would be difficult to maintain. Probably the latest historian of Charles V. hits the mark accurately enough when he says: "Clement VII. was learned, clever, respectable and industrious, but he had little enterprise and less decision."²² But to writers like Mr. Pollard, Father Taunton, and to some extent also Dr. Busch, Clement is a contemptible figure, a man without religious principle or moral backbone, and at all times the willing servant of the stronger party. From this view I must beg to record my emphatic dissent. It seems to me to be not only in conflict with the available evidence, but to be founded on a very misleading fallacy.

Let me touch upon the fallacy first. It is often assumed that the motive which most frequently influences a man's conduct is also the only, or at any rate the most powerful motive by which he is governed. Or to put the matter another way, we assume that because on nineteen occasions out of twenty a man squares his conscience with his interest, therefore he is swayed by interest alone, and that when conscience and interest conflict in a grave matter conscience must go to the wall. But it is surely a very narrow and indiscriminating view of human nature which argues thus. A man may be very fertile in expedients for reconciling pleasure and duty, but yet he may be throughout in a measure loyal to duty, and when he is driven into a corner and has to make his choice between one or the

²¹ Brewer, "Henry VIII.," Vol. II., p. 236, note. The above is by no means a solitary example of unfamiliarity with the details of his subject in the author I am criticizing. For instance, on page 169 it is stated that Catherine of Aragon was at least three years older than Arthur. The truth is there was not a year between them. Catherine was born on December 15, 1485 (Bergenroth, "Supplement," p. xix.); Arthur on September 19, 1486. Again we read ("Thomas Wolsey," p. 206): "A few days before the legatine court adjourned, that is to say on July 13, 1530, a petition was sent to the Pope from the Lords, spiritual and temporal, imploring him to consent to the King's desire." But the legatine court was adjourned on July 23, 1529, and consequently twelve months before the petition of the Lords. It would be tedious to give further illustrations.

²² Armstrong, "The Emperor Charles V.," Vol. I., p. 166.

other, it may be duty which gains the day. As we know from the case of Lord Bacon, it would be a rash inference which argued that a judge who takes presents is a wholly unprincipled and unjust judge. The manners of a different age from ours, the fictions and fine distinctions of the law, a training in casuistry or diplomacy, the rather degrading associations of the Secret Service or the intelligence department, and many other things, will often allow a man to retain his self-respect and a certain natural integrity throughout conduct which we may find it in many details hard to justify. So, I believe, it was with Pope Clement. He was, no doubt, a weak man, a man by nature singularly ill fitted to cope with the really terrible pressure to which he was exposed. He yielded at times to the extreme limit of what his conscience would allow. But yet there is no evidence to show that he was ever indifferent to principle or right, that he was the slave of any human master, or that he was prepared in any grave matter to sacrifice conscience to self-interest.²³

In this sense it seems to me that the following passage in one of Dr. Gairdner's articles is well worthy of remark. He has been expressing some doubt of the accuracy of Gardiner's rather boastful accounts of the concessions he had extorted from the Pope:

"Of these later interviews it must be remembered that Gardiner is the sole reporter, and how far he is to be trusted as regards their real character we may judge by what we have already seen. The fear of the Emperor was a frequent taunt, partly admitted as a fact, and at times even put forward by the Pope himself as an excuse for non-compliance with the demands of the English. But no such fear, we may be well assured, could have affected the decision of the Pope's advisers as to whether a certain process was regular or not. If it could have done so, the days of the Papacy would indeed have been numbered; for its functions would have been discredited in the eyes of all Europe, and secular princes themselves would have attached little value to sanctions which would have been given or withheld just as it might please the power which happened for the moment to be stronger."²⁴

²³ There are some very significant sentences in a confidential letter of Sir Gregory Casale to his brother Vincent Casale (Brewer, 5302): "I hear," he says, "you have told Wolsey that if the Pope's fears were removed, he would do everything for the King, *licita et illicita*. But if you rightly remember, I told you that the Pope would do all that could be done; for there are many things which the Pope says he cannot do *veluti esset bulla decretalis*. . . . When, therefore, you say that the Pope will do *illicita*, that must be understood *quae aliquo modo possint colorari*; . . . if the Pope's fears were altogether removed, he will never do what we shall want of him." It is quite clear that Gregory Casale was satisfied that Clement was moved by other considerations besides mere fear of the Emperor.

²⁴ The *English Historical Review*, 1896, p. 700.

I welcome this wise utterance the more heartily for its bearing on certain cynical comments of Mr. Pollard, who, recalling some of the matrimonial decisions of the Popes at this period, urges that when other marriages were annulled upon the flimsiest pretexts, it would be idle to suppose that any mere consideration for law or justice could have prevented Clement from giving a decision in Henry's favor. He narrates, for instance, at length the circumstances of the various divorces which centre round the history of Queen Margaret of Scotland, Henry VIII.'s sister, and in another passage refers to a case still more nearly akin to that of Catherine of Arragon.

"Alexander VI.," he says, "had divorced Louis XII. from his Queen for no other reasons than that Louis XII. wanted to unite Brittany with France by marrying its duchess and that Alexander, the Borgia Pope, required Louis' assistance in promoting the interests of the iniquitous Borgia family. The injustice to Catherine was no greater than that to Louis' Queen. Henry's sister Margaret and both the husbands of his other sister, Mary, had procured divorces from Popes, and why not Henry himself?"²⁵

Now, with regard to the case of Queen Margaret, or the others which he mentions, we have to take Mr. Pollard's word for the causes specified and all other details. It is only when we have before us the actual pleadings and documents that we can judge whether the grounds alleged are flimsy or not. I do not know if these processes are preserved, but Mr. Pollard gives no references, and his account of Louis XII.'s divorce is so completely misleading that he forfeits all confidence. However, in the case of this same divorce of Louis XII. from his wife, Blessed Jeanne de Valois—she was afterwards beatified—we happen to possess the full record of the proceedings, the whole of which have been printed without curtailment.²⁶ It is an extraordinarily interesting history which well deserves a few moments' consideration.

Let me say, in the first place, that however convinced the reader might be of the justice of Jeanne's cause, it would be impossible for him, if he has any respect for legal forms, to regard the process as a mockery. There was a formidable amount of evidence given to prove the compulsion under which Louis as a boy of 14 had originally contracted the marriage, as he alleged, against his will, and the insults with which he had assailed his wife's want of comeliness. Then the husband declared that the marriage had never been duly consummated, in support of which there was the undisputed fact

²⁵ Pollard, "Henry VIII.," p. 151.

²⁶ "Procès de Divorce de Louis XII." Edited by M. Maulde de la Clavière. See especially pp. 932 seq.

that no children had been born, and, however worthy of respect her motive may have been, there was the equally certain fact that Jeanne refused to submit to a medical examination. Instead of this, the Queen, when pressed, elected to allow the case to be decided by the King's oath. Certain interrogatories were drawn up by her advisers. They concerned matters as to which the King had already pledged himself in evidence, taken, as I suppose we should now say, on commission. But the Queen seemingly believed that Louis would not solemnly perjure himself if these interrogatories were administered to him with all legal forms in the presence of the judges. In this she seems to have been mistaken. Though the acts of the process explain to us how the Cardinal President impressively harangued the appellant, admonishing him that it was the part of a true King to fear God and speak the truth, after the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, who was the Truth itself, and reminding him, moreover, of the eternal damnation which awaited those who forswear themselves, still Louis, though he has not otherwise the reputation of being an impious or a vicious man, took the oath upon the Gospels, answered the forty odd questions addressed to him, affirmed most solemnly that the marriage with Jeanne had never been consummated, and finally signed his name at the foot of a written report of his replies.

Whether this testimony was perjured or not—and the whole question seems to me extremely puzzling—it would not be easy to imagine a more impressive tribute to the strict integrity with which the recognized forms of law were observed in the Papal courts. If a monarch, a powerful monarch, with whom the Holy See was at that time in most confidential relations, had to humble himself and perjure his soul to this extent before he could extort the annulment of his childless marriage from a Pontiff like Alexander VI., there can have been nothing after all so fundamentally corrupt in the matrimonial decisions of the Roman Curia.

Moreover, it is interesting to remark that the account of this transaction current in the historians of the time, is, as the documents of the process show, entirely misleading and always to the discredit of the Holy See.

"If," says M. Maulde de la Clavierè, "we were to accept Guicciardini's account, or, for the matter of that, the account almost universally given of this occurrence even in the contemporary despatches of ambassadors, we should have to suppose that the whole procedure in the divorce was a pure formality, that everything had been arranged beforehand between the Pope and the King, and that the cause from the first moved smoothly and smilingly onward to a foregone conclusion." But from three important Papal briefs

discovered by M. Maulde ten years after all the other documents of the process had been printed by him for the French Government, we learn that this was very far from being the case.

These papers established the fact that the verdict remained in suspense to the very last; that the King Louis XII. was reduced to quite an agony of apprehension, and that Alexander VI. maintained throughout an attitude that was both firm and dignified.

"It was evidently," writes M. Maulde, "upon the receipt of this last reply of Alexander VI., dated November 20, that the King made up his mind to take the very distasteful oath tendered him by Jeanne de France. The oath was taken on the 5th of December, and in this way the difficulties of the process were at last brought to an end."²⁷

I may notice here that Jeanne having by what was, as far as we can judge, a perfectly voluntary act, elected to submit her case to the King's sworn testimony, could not regard herself as wronged by the judges who pronounced a verdict in accordance with that testimony. There are no doubt many marriage dispensations and dissolutions of this period in which the Holy See appears to have acted upon grounds that were very technical, not to say frivolous, being aided therein by an extremely complex marriage law prolific in unforeseen flaws and impediments, of which, of course, the canonists took full advantage. But one principle seems to have been steadily kept in view amid all these legal subtleties, and that was respect for the rights of the innocent, at any rate in all cases in which the innocent could succeed in making their voice heard. In this matter I cannot at all subscribe to Father Taunton's conclusion²⁸ that "the question of justice towards Catherine" played no part in the Papal deliberations, but that such words as "injustice, peril and scandal" refer only to the difficulties of the Pope's personal position and the will of the Emperor, his master. "Although these were the pricks which were felt and complained of, the great influence at the back of all was the insuperable difficulty of Catherine's rights, which she would not renounce or surrender. When, as we learn from Gardiner's despatches, Clement was pressed to extremities he declared that he was powerless *ubi vertitur jus tertii*."²⁹ It was for this reason that Campeggio tried so persistently to induce Catherine to enter a nunnery. If she had consented to do this, this would have been practically to renounce her rights as a wife and her further claim on Henry. Supposing this to have been secured, I may confess that I think it not improbable that some technical ground

²⁷ "Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes," 1896, pp. 197-204.

²⁸ L. c., p. 195.

²⁹ Pocock, "Records," Vol. I., p. 127.

would have been found on which to annul the marriage. Moreover, seeing the momentous issues involved in the alienation of Henry, and the extreme perplexity of such matrimonial cases resting ultimately on impediments created by the positive law, I do not believe that in contributing to such a result either Clement or Campeggio would have felt that they were sacrificing principle or acting against their consciences. The one obstacle before which they were powerless was the indisputable right of Catherine to defend the marriage and to plead her cause before an impartial tribunal. If she would not waive that right, nothing could be done.

Another point to which Mr. Pollard scornfully appeals as showing how little religious principle had to say to Clement's attitude towards the divorce, is the various expedients supposed to have been suggested by the Pope in the hopes of satisfying Henry without offending Spain. With regard to such proposals as that Henry should have leave to marry two wives, or that he should settle the matter for himself by marrying Anne in England, and then applying to the Holy See to confirm the accomplished fact, we have the gravest reason to doubt the accuracy³⁰ of the reports preserved to us. It is quite possible that something of the sort was mooted, but not in serious earnest. The envoys themselves suspected that the proposed dispensation to marry two wives was a diplomatic trap. The fact was that Henry at that time flatly denied the Pope's power to dispense for the marriage with a brother's widow, and if he had jumped at a Papal dispensation for bigamy, he would have been convicted of gross inconsistency. There was, however, one very startling suggestion which undoubtedly comes to us on better authority.

"Another plan for settling the succession," writes Mr. Pollard, "was that the Duke of Richmond (Henry's illegitimate son) should by Papal dispensation marry his half-sister, Mary."³¹ Cardinal

³⁰ Dr. Ehses has dealt with this subject in an article in the *Historisches Jahrbuch* for 1892. It is very questionable how far we can trust Gregorio Casale's despatches. "Either you do not write the truth," Wolsey once told him, "or we and you are equally deceived." Brewer, n. 4289. We know that Gardiner left a sheet of paper in Henry's way containing a proposition which purported to emanate from the Pope and which suggested that Henry should take the law into his own hands and act by the light of his own conscience. After Henry had read it, Gardiner told him that it was not a genuine document, but only a fancy of his own. "Non è cosa buona; ma una fantasia che mi era venuta." It is Campeggio who reports this on Wolsey's authority. This letter has only recently come to light. See the *Römische Quartalschrift*, 1900, pp. 260-266.

³¹ Mr. Pollard does not make it clear that this suggestion was made to Campeggio by Wolsey and his friends. Speaking of Wolsey and the King's advisers, Campeggio writes: "Et hanno pensato di maritarla condispensa di sua Santità al figliuolo natural del re, se si potrà fare. A che habeva anch' i. pensato prima per stabilimento della successione." Ehses, p. 49.

Campeggio saw no moral objection to this. 'At first I myself,' he writes on his arrival in England in October, 1528, 'had thought of this as a means of establishing the succession.' The Pope was equally willing to facilitate the scheme on condition that Henry abandoned his divorce from Catherine. Possibly Henry saw more objections than Pope or Cardinal to a marriage between brother and sister. At all events, Mary was soon betrothed to a French prince."³²

Astounding as this suggestion may seem, we must remember: first, that this was a solution by which Catherine's rights would not suffer; and, secondly, that it was only entertained by Campeggio as a remedy for what, as Wolsey had again and again insisted, was an absolutely desperate situation, involving no less than the defection of England from the Roman obedience. When the Italian Cardinal was satisfied that this would not content Henry he at once dismissed the idea and does not recur to it in his correspondence.³³ Moreover, whatever the Pope may have said in his ignorance, which he often freely confessed, of the limits to which the Papal dispensing power might be stretched, it was decided when his advisers were consulted that such a dispensation could not be granted.

The idea of the possibility of this union between a sister and a half-brother seems to have originated from an apocryphal instance of such a dispensation, said to have been granted in the time of Pope Martin V. and discussed by many canonists and theologians, *e. g.*, by St. Antoninus of Florence. Most of them seem inclined, like St. Antoninus, to doubt the fact, but some do not think such a marriage so clearly forbidden by the natural law as to lie absolutely beyond an extreme exercise of the Papal prerogative. Curiously enough the reformer Tyndall, the translator of the New Testament, and certainly no Roman, did not consider such a marriage impossible any more than Wolsey or Campeggio.

"Nevertheless," he writes, "the marriage of the brother with the sister is not so grievous against the law of nature (thinketh me) as the degrees above rehearsed. And therefore it seemeth me that it might be dispensed within certain cases and for divers considerations. . . . Wherefore, if greater peace and unity might be made by keeping her (the daughter) at home, I durst dispense with it; as if the King of England had a son by one wife, heir to England, and a daughter by another, heir to Wales, then because

³² Pollard, "Henry VIII.," p. 135. Further on Mr. Pollard, returning to the subject, remarks of this proposal that Clement was quite ready to entertain it because "the more insuperable the obstacle, the more its removal enhanced his power."

³³ He goes on: "Non credo però, che questo disegno basti per rimuovere il primo desiderio del rè." *Ib.*

of the great war that was ever wont to be between those countries I would not fear to marry them together to make both countries one and to avoid so great effusion of blood."³⁴

It has been already said that it would be idle to pretend to regard Clement as a man of heroic mould or of the loftiest ideals. Dr. Gairdner has censured, and with justice, the regrettable weakness which allowed him to yield to Wolsey's passionate appeals, and to grant first the secret decretal commission, and then the "pollicitation" or promise not to revoke the cause, of which Dr. Eheses has published for the first time the authentic text.³⁵ But there is one plea which may be urged in mitigation of Clement's action in these two instances. If the much harassed Pontiff was committing himself further than justice or prudence allowed, he was nevertheless entrusting his honor to the keeping of one in whom he felt every confidence and who in the fullest degree justified that confidence. The decretal and the pollicitation were not granted by the Pope until after he knew that it was Campeggio who had been chosen and had accepted the charge of representing the Pontifical authority in England. From the beginning to the end of his mission there is not one recorded act of Campeggio's which can be described as falling short of the dignity and impartiality which were to be expected of one who was invested with such high responsibilities. He has been represented by some as playing into the hands of the Emperor, But to Catherine he barely showed decent sympathy, much less favor. To the Spanish ambassador he was affable, but made no sign of further confidences. Popular humor, on the other hand, declared him to be the creature of Henry. He had accepted this legation at the pressing request of the English court. He was already Bishop of Salisbury; he had much to hope for from the King if he were compliant; he had something to lose if he were slack in the cause. But from the first he maintained his independence in the most resolute way. Though very ill provided with resources, he would not accept a penny of the sums that were proffered him, while neither threats nor cajolery could lead him to depart a hair's breadth from the Pope's instructions regarding the custody of the secret decretal. Speaking of the chronicler Hall, who sneers at the meanness of Campeggio's baggage when it was searched at Dover before leaving England, Mr. Brewer says:

"Hall was ignorant of the fact that Campeggio had been repeatedly urged by the King to abandon all preparations for his journey, as all things necessary would be provided for him by the King's liberality. More than once he had refused large sums of money

³⁴ Tyndall, "Practice of Papistical Prelates" (1530), p. 331.

³⁵ "Römische Dokumente," p. 30.

offered him for this purpose by the Bishop of Bath.³⁶ The King never repeated his offer or fulfilled his promise; and there is not the least reason for believing, as Hall asserts, that the legate received any great reward for his arduous services. No minute to that effect is found among the King's payments."³⁷

In spite of our possessing Campeggio's cipher despatches, the real nature of his ideas about the divorce question is something of a mystery to us; but this we know, that he was responsible for the frustration of the hopes of a final and favorable verdict which Henry entertained to the last. The resolution to prorogue the case and to issue no decision was entirely the work of Campeggio. Moreover, this decision was arrived at and acted upon before any news could have reached England of the Pope's avocation of the cause to Rome.

There seems the more reason for insisting on the worthy part played by the Italian Legate because Cardinal Wolsey's recent apologist, not content with telling his readers that Wolsey was "the only man who came out of the divorce business with clean hands,"³⁸ (!) and with deploring that in his efforts to do Henry's will Wolsey "had been outwitted by Italian shiftiness and Spanish terrorism,"³⁹ has also gone out of his way to present Campeggio in the most unfavorable light. The "diplomatic gout" which delayed Campeggio's journey to England is ridiculed as a contemptible subterfuge. And yet we know that eight months before, when there was as yet no question of Campeggio's coming to England, an English envoy reports that he was in Rome "sore vexed with the gout."⁴⁰ We know that when his name was proposed for this mission a short time afterward (April, 1528) one of the principal objections raised to his appointment was that he was such a martyr to this complaint that it was doubtful whether he would not suffer most cruelly upon the journey.⁴¹ We know both from many outside testimonies and from his own secret cypher despatches that both in Paris and on his arrival in London and for weeks afterwards he was in the most severe pain and incapable of putting foot to the ground. So, again, the fair speeches which Campeggio, like every diplomatic agent, was required by courtesy to use, are construed into evidence of studied duplicity, while all the gratuitous deceptions and protesta-

³⁶ These, however, seem to have been offered in the King's name and by the King's direction. See Brewer, II., p. 293.

³⁷ Brewer, "Henry VIII.," Vol. II., p. 375.

³⁸ Preface, p. viii.

³⁹ P. 202.

⁴⁰ "Burnet" (Pocock), Vol. IV., p. 40.

⁴¹ Pocock, "Records," Vol. I., p. 117. Gardiner there says: "It is feared of him 'ne in itinere labore podagra cui morbo mirum in modum obnoxius est.'"

tions of which Wolsey was guilty in his appeals to the Pope are treated as innocent. But what more particularly calls for some protest is the insinuation made against Campeggio's moral character. Referring to the Cardinal's earlier mission to Germany, Father Taunton remarks:

"We learn from the Venetian State papers that in the Consistory he (Campeggio) made three conditions before he would accept the office. He required 2,000 ducats to be paid down before he left Rome; the Papal promise, in case of his death during the legation, that the bishopric of Bologna should be given to his son, and that the Pope should also undertake to provide a husband for one of his daughters, both of these children being illegitimate (III. n. 795). The latter fact is mentioned by Giustiniani (II. 1178) and Sanuto's diaries confirm it."⁴²

Further, though I know no evidence to justify such an imputation, the writer adds: "The history of the Campeggio is not of the highest."

Let me remark first, that if the credibility of the Venetian envoy may be gauged by the accuracy of his last statement, it is highly probable that the whole story is mere malicious gossip. It is absolutely certain that Campeggio's five children were born in lawful wedlock. The Cardinal had previously been a lay professor of law at Bologna, where he married a distinguished Bolognese lady, Francesca Guastavillani, in the year 1500. She died in 1511, leaving him three sons and two daughters.⁴³ It was after her death that Campeggio began his ecclesiastical career, was made Auditor of the Rota, and took Holy Orders. One of his sons died young. The other two entered the Church; both became Bishops, and Alexander, the elder, died a Cardinal like his father.⁴⁴ It is additionally unfortunate that to read the account just quoted one would almost necessarily be led to suppose that the illegitimacy of Campeggio's children was a fact established by three independent authorities, to wit: the Venetian despatch, Giustiniani and Sanuto's diaries. Whoever will take the trouble to look up Mr. Rawdon Browne's calendars will find that the three reduce themselves to one, an unnamed

⁴² "Thomas Wolsey," p. 191, note.

⁴³ Von Schulte ("Geschichte der Quellen und Litt. des Kanon. Rechtes," Vol. II., p. 359), who has investigated these facts, is surely a witness beyond all exception. Moreover, Dr. Ehses has accumulated a number of additional details and prefixed a short biography of Campeggio to his "Römische Dokumente," pp. xvi.-xxxi. Campeggio's life was first written by Sigonius in 1581.

⁴⁴ There is not, so far as I know, any evidence to suggest that either of the younger Campeggios were otherwise than worthy and learned prelates. Alexander was a distinguished canonist. Lorenzo resigned his bishopric before his death and gave himself to study and to works of charity.

Venetian correspondent in Rome. "Sanuto's Diaries" are merely the memorandum book in which this scrap of gossip is preserved; and Giustiniani's testimony consists in a casual reference to Campeggio's son without the slightest suggestion that he was illegitimate. That Campeggio was in any conspicuous way grasping or mercenary, the whole of his singularly hard-working and suffering life contradicts.

Finally, I venture to quote a sentence of one of the last of Campeggio's cipher letters from England. Dr. Gairdner believes it to be, and I think that any impartial reader who studies this correspondence will also believe it to be the perfectly sincere expression of Campeggio's true sentiments. The evidence had not yet been taken in the trial, and the Cardinal seems still inclined to think that justice might require a verdict in the King's favor. "But," he says, "when I shall know positively that the King is in the wrong, I shall be ready to give sentence against him fearlessly, even if I were certain to die that moment; do not doubt it."⁴⁵ And he adds: "His Holiness will learn from other sources the position I am in, and how heavy is my burden. May God help me, in whom I trust."

It would be hard to find in the diplomatic correspondence of those days a more striking example of a manly, upright spirit, constant in spite of much physical infirmity and moral obloquy, than is presented to us in the recently published letters of Cardinal Campeggio.

HERBERT THURSTON, S. J.

London, England.

MODERN ITALY TO A VISITOR.

IT WAS near the end of October when I reached Italy last year. The crowd of summer tourists from England, America and other parts had nearly all flitted homewards, and I met scarcely any English-speaking people except at Florence and Rome. The winter visitors of that description I found in numbers in Naples and Sicily, which serve the wealthy classes of England for a resort in the cold months, much as Florida does Americans. I was consequently thrown entirely among Italians for society and information, and as far as possible my desire was to learn their ways and ideas as they really are, not as an American might wish them to be.

The winter weather did not show Italy at its best, though for some time the St. Martin's summer of November was very beautiful

⁴⁵ Ehse, "Römische Dokumente," pp. 108-109.

in Piedmont. Rain was the chief drawback to outdoor investigations. On passing through the Mont Cenis tunnel a thick fog covered the Italian side and hid the views completely till Turin was reached. In Turin it rained steadily through the first week of November, and in Rome through the first of December. The Tiber threatened one of the new bridges and flooded the road to the Basilica of St. Paul for some days. Rain came spasmodically all through the two last months of the year, but there were enough clear intervals to make some interesting trips through country places with and without the aid of the railroads. A couple of weeks were passed most agreeably in Masserano, a small country town of Piedmont, at the foot of the Alps, and in excursions around it to similar places. An old Italian friend had been Sindaco, or Mayor, of the town for fourteen years, and had resigned office a few months before my coming. From him I learned a good deal about the thoughts and methods of life of the country folk of Piedmont as well of general conditions of modern Italy. After leaving his house my course lay by the Italian lakes to Milan, where some days were spent, stopping at an Italian hotel and boarding at Italian restaurants. Venice was the next stopping place, then, in succession, Padua, Bologna and Florence. The capital of Tuscany kept me a week, which I would gladly have extended to double the time. On the way to Rome brief stops were made at Orvieto to view the wonderfully beautiful and extraordinary basilica which commemorates the miracle of Bolsena, nearly six hundred years ago, and at Monte Rotondo, a typical village community of the country around Rome.

The Eternal City was my abode through Advent and the Christmas holidays. Though many American and Irish friends were met at Rome, I continued the practice of living chiefly among Italians, and in their manner largely. Early in January I quitted Rome for Naples, halting on the way at the famous Benedictine Abbey of Monte Cassino, which itself is one of the historic monuments of Western civilization as the cradle of the great monastic orders. At Naples the same mode of life was followed as at Rome, except that more time was given to visits to places outside the city in consequence of the delightful weather. A trip to Sicily, with stops at Messina and Palermo and a visit to Taormina and Etna on the east coast, was the last stage in my trip. It certainly was shorter than could be desired, and left countless places of high interest unvisited but at least with most of the great divisions of the Peninsula and its modern people.

A fact which is brought home to any one living among Italians of different provinces is the marked difference of temper, cultivation and character between the various provinces which make up the

new kingdom. Florentines differ more from Neapolitans or Piedmontese than the New Orleans creoles do from Bostonians or Pennsylvanians. There is no such homogeneity of national feeling in Italy as in France or England. Tuscany, Piedmont, Lombardy, Venezia, the Roman Marches, the Neapolitan city population, Sicily and Sardinia are each as distinctly national in character as Belgium or Geneva in the French-speaking population. The feeling of local independence goes even further. Padua resents the rivalry of Venice as much as Belgians do that of Holland. In the old Grand Duchy of Tuscany, with hardly three millions of people, who have been united under a single government for nearly four hundred years, Sienna and Pisa still decline to recognize the Florentines as genuine countrymen of their citizens. On my arrival in Naples a gentleman with whom I got into conversation informed me the city population there was "la piu sbirra," the meanest of all Italy, and could hardly be regarded as Italians. I asked was he from the north, and was a little surprised when he assured me he was from Foggia in Puglia, scarcely a hundred miles from Naples. A bright and good-humored little woman who served me with refreshments in a *caffe* an hour or two later cautioned me as a stranger against the Neapolitan lower classes generally. They were idle, ignorant and generally good for nothing in her opinion, though she had lived some years at Naples. She was a Milanese, she was glad to say. This deep spirit of rivalry and distrust between the different provinces of the Italian kingdom is a matter which needs to be counted seriously in reference to the probable duration of the work of Cavour and Vittorio Emanuele. It also suggests the great difficulties in carrying out in practice the centralized administration which those statesmen and their successors have imposed on Italy in imitation of French models.

A few of the points of diversity among the different provinces may help to give a clearer idea of how great it is. In language the bulk of the country population everywhere speaks a dialect of its own quite distinct from that of others. A very intelligent lawyer at Rome assured me that neither Victor Emmanuel nor Umberto spoke correct Italian. They used Piedmontese habitually, which is as distinct from the language of Florence as Lowland Scotch is from English. My legal friend was a Venetian and spoke without prejudice on this matter. For himself he had a strong affection for the Venetian dialect, which he claimed had more elements of Greek and Spanish than Piedmontese. A couple of days later a party of travelers took a table near my Venetian friend and myself, and neither of us could decide what language they were speaking. Another member of our table happening to come in, we asked his

opinion, and he answered at once they were all Piedmontese. He was a captain in the army, but belonged to Novara; in Piedmont, and was quite familiar with the local dialect of his native place, which was hardly intelligible to an Italian from Venice, three hundred miles away.

The difference in dialects is still greater to the south of Rome. In Naples and the country around it the working people, if they have to address an Italian from another district, commonly use signs to signify their meaning. The language of the Sicilian country people is as different from ordinary Italian as Portuguese from Spanish. Many villages, in fact, use Greek or Albanian habitually, even on the mainland of Naples. These Italian dialects are not mere vulgarisms, like the speech of some English counties or that of remote districts in the Southern American States. Many of them have grammars, dictionaries and histories of their own, and even the educated classes who are familiar with classical Italian and use it in their daily work will prefer to speak their own dialect in their families, as Boswell's father once treated Dr. Johnson to an argument in Lowland Scotch. My Venetian and Piedmontese friends both used the best Italian in table conversation and quoted Dante, Tasso and Petrarch with as much familiarity as an educated American would Shakespeare, but as soon as a native of their own provinces appeared neither could resist the temptation to chat a few moments in the familiar native dialect.

These differences of local speech make any generalized plan of elementary school teaching singularly difficult in Italy. The children of the peasantry only speak the local dialect, and to teach them approved grammatical Italian is a task as hard as to teach a French or German child English in the primary classes. Though school attendance has been made obligatory in Italy, it has been found impossible to enforce the law, and it remains a dead letter. This fact, among many others, seems to suggest that modern Italy really needs a system of localized government like that of Switzerland, rather than the centralization which it has been the aim of all Italian Ministers from Cavour to Zanardelli to force on the populations as a means of consolidating them into a State like France or England.

The manners and temper of the people in the various provinces are as divergent nearly as the dialects. In Turin the resemblance to French ways in attention to small details of courtesy is noticeable. In stores, hotels and generally in all intercourse a stranger finds the Turinese anxious to please and good natured in helping him out of his common perplexities. It is somewhat the same at Milan, though with less cordiality. In Venice the popular manners

are good, but there seems little anxiety to consult the convenience of strangers. The Florentines of all classes are well bred, but show a certain half cynical temper. They resemble in this to a certain extent the old aristocratic families of France. Rome is somewhat cosmopolitan, and gives less subject for remark on this head. At Naples the popular manners, without being rough, are reserved towards strangers and have a certain clownishness that is not found in Northern Italy. In Sicily, even in the cities, the manners of all classes are much more reserved and indifferent towards outsiders. In a restaurant or store the attendants take orders almost in silence and with none of the attempts to make themselves agreeable that one meets in Turin or even Florence. Their methods of doing business are also very primitive in many points. Change is very difficult to get, even in stores, for anything above a five-franc bill. It is somewhat aggravating to see every franc one offers in payment rung three or four times and carefully examined on every side before acceptance. Both in Sicily and Naples the offices of money changers, "Cambia Valute," are a distinct business, and one generally has to apply to them if he wants change for even a two-dollar or ten-franc note. Caffes, so marked a feature of social life in North Italy as in France, are very rare in Naples. I only noticed four on the Corso from the Central Railroad station to the centre of the city, more than a mile of well-built and crowded streets. In France there would be more than a hundred in the same distance. As life in Naples is largely out of doors, this absence of places for social meeting suggests a general indifference to conversation and mutual intercourse. It bears out in this the impression given by the manners of the people to a new arrival. The absence of name plates from most of the Neapolitan streets is another example of the indifference to strangers which is very marked. It is all the more remarkable inasmuch as Naples is very extensively visited by foreigners in the winter months. The spirit of commercial intelligence seems strangely lacking in this city of three-quarters of a million of inhabitants. The difference in this respect between the population of Naples and those of Genoa or Milan is greater than between the latter and American or English cities.

The difference is not merely one of manners; it is also one of occupations and disposition. Milan, Genoa or even smaller cities like Biella are fully up to modern ideas of material improvements and commercial activity. The Società de Navigazione Italiana Generale is as great a steamship company and as well served as any in England, Germany or America. Its origin is in Genoa, not Naples. Milan and Biella are as much manufacturing communities as Lowell or Paterson. The electric power works near Milan for

utilizing the force of the Alpine torrents are on a scale unsurpassed in Europe. The railroad service in North Italy is fully up to the best American or English standards and much cheaper than either. Local railroads, electric or steam power, are very numerous through Lombardy and Piedmont. Street cars, public lighting, water supply and other public services are all excellent. In Naples generally there seems to have been little change from the conditions of the eighteenth century in most of these points except what has been of necessity. Paving is generally good in all Italian towns, and the buildings, both public and private, are substantial and handsome, but modern conveniences seem scarcely cared for in Southern Italy or the central parts of the peninsula.

In one important branch of industry, the cultivation of the soil, it must be said that Italy seems in advance of most European nations. The farming through Lombardy and Tuscany is like that of carefully kept gardens, and crops of some kind seem to be gathered at almost every season. The ground is no sooner cleared of grain than it is made to yield a crop of vegetables of some kind before the new harvest is put in. Between the rows of fruit trees, laid out with geometrical accuracy, vegetables or grasses are regularly raised. Irrigation is scientifically conducted, especially in Lombardy. Tradition assigns the methods now followed for utilizing the Alpine floods to fertilize the Lombard plain to Leonardo da Vinci, the almost universal genius of the sixteenth century, who disputed the supremacy of the painter's art with Michael Angelo. In Piedmont, where the mountainous soil does not give the same opportunity for irrigation, every district has its own well-defined system of culture for vines, fruit, vegetables and grain which is strictly followed out. I was struck by the familiarity shown by my Piedmontese friend, the ex-Mayor, with the name and special value of every tree on his small estate. It hardly was twenty acres in extent, yet it was enough to maintain his family in very comfortable style. In these districts nearly everything needed for home consumption was raised, even on holdings of three or four acres. Wine, cheese, firewood, eggs, milk and vegetables are never purchased by a Piedmontese country resident. They are all raised on his own land. The Commune of Masserano comprised about seven thousand acres, and it supported forty-five hundred inhabitants, among whom there was not a single mendicant nor prisoner at the time of my visit. The condition of these Northern Italian peasants in regard to dwellings, food, clothing and personal independence was much better than that of the Irish or even the English peasantry. All through Italy the farming classes generally live in towns or villages. Isolated farm houses, as in America or Ireland, are very rare. The

villages are built of good houses of stone, often three or four stories high, divided into flats according to custom, which seems to run back a couple of thousand years at least. Each village possesses its church or often three or four, its schools, town hall and other public buildings, and the farmers govern themselves in local affairs much as any other town population. In Masserano the palace of the former princes was used as the town hall. There were five churches, two or three being several hundred years old and only used on special festivals. It is rarely in Italy that a church is torn down, even when not needed longer for public service. It is preserved as a monument of the past, and receives some care as a sanctuary.

A feature in Italian cultivation of the land, especially in the south, is the closeness with which it copies the methods of nature in the choice of objects. The olive and cactus plantations of Naples and Sicily to a passer have all the look of free nature. There is none of the ruthless sweeping away of forests by steam machinery or the planting of thousands of acres in fields of wheat and corn that one sees so commonly in America. Trees everywhere find a prominent place in the Italian farming districts. The olive or mulberry groves stretch up slopes where the plough would be almost impossible, and the rocky slopes beyond are often planted with clumps of the Barbary, fig or cactus. This fruit, so common in California and so little utilized there, furnishes a large supply of excellent fruit to the Neapolitans and Sicilians. The latter, if lacking in commercial enterprise, are certainly careful cultivators of the land. The rocky island of Capri, near Naples, is a wonderful instance of what industry can effect in the way of extracting food for man from the rocks. The island is not over three or four thousand acres in extent, and most of it is occupied by two bare peaks, one eleven hundred, the other, Mount Solari, seventeen hundred feet high. On the slopes of these peaks and little stretch of sloping land between them the ground is thickly covered with orange, fig and cactus, as well as with vegetables between them. The island supports nearly six thousand people on the yield of these and the fishing carried on in the sea. That the life they lead is not a dismal one may be inferred from the fact that though many of the men yearly emigrate to America, North or South, the majority return to their rocky birth-place after a few years' absence. Even in a material point it seems that modern science has hardly achieved very remarkable advances over the methods of cultivation of Southern Europe as practiced for a couple of thousand years.

The strong liking among Italians of all classes for farming as the occupation of life is very noticeable. It is specially so to an

American from the far West, where men go into wheat or beet raising on the same methods as they buy shares in the Stock Exchange. My friend was an engineer by profession, had graduated from the University of Turin, traveled abroad as far as California and spent two years there, yet he assured me he preferred to make a livelihood for himself and family from his vineyard and orchard than to earn a large revenue otherwise. One remembers how Verdi, the famous composer, passed the later years of his life in farming, and with what deep feeling Virgil sang the praises of the country life in old Italy. The sentiment that cultivation of the ground and raising food for mankind is in itself a better employment of a man's time than turning thousands on stock speculation or the rise and fall of prices is common among educated Italians. It is much rarer in our own land, but it seems to have an evident element of philosophy and Christianity, too, for all that. It is only a couple of hundred years since Penn began the settlement of Pennsylvania. It is ten times as long since the foundation of Milan or Florence. Have not Americans a good deal to learn yet from old Master Time?

The past year was a distinctly good harvest throughout, and the country folk generally seemed prosperous. I heard, however, many complaints of the crushing taxation of the central government. The budget amounted to nearly three hundred and sixty million dollars for the year, or eleven dollars a head on each Italian. The national wealth of Italy is much less than in France or England, yet the burthens on the citizens are nearly as great. The value of the agricultural produce of France for the year was estimated at two thousand eight hundred million dollars, and that of Italy at twelve hundred millions. As France has thirty-eight millions of people and Italy thirty-three it seems that the average earnings in Italy are less than one-half those in France. A County Judge receives six hundred dollars a year, and is considered to be well paid. The town physician of Masserano received four hundred and his office was thought quite a lucrative one. Farm laborers there received from thirty to forty cents per diem, mechanics, as carpenters or masons, from seventy-five cents to a dollar. Through the country districts generally it is safe to say that the franc (twenty cents) represents as much as the dollar does in ordinary life in an American city. From that one can judge how great is the weight of a taxation of fifty-five francs annually on every human being in Italy to-day.

The visit of the King of Italy to France occurred during my stay in Paris, but was a good deal spoken of in Italy afterwards. The general feeling seemed one of moderate satisfaction at the renewal of friendly relations with France. The ill feeling between

the two countries had been mainly caused by the policy of the late Minister Crispi. Of that gentleman I hardly heard a good word from an Italian of any class. Nevertheless he held power during a number of years by arts not unfamiliar in American politics. One asks what a Frenchman will be saying of Combes in a few years hence.

There was also considerable satisfaction expressed by Italians generally over the improvement in the financial standing of Italy accomplished during the last few years. The Minister of Finance, Lucchate, was credited much with this change both in Italy and France. There is no longer a deficit between the yearly tax receipts and the yearly expenditures of Italy, and Italian securities command as high a price on the Stock Exchange as those of France. Both conditions are new in Italy. Since Cavour and Victor Emmanuel first made the modern King till recently its spendings have nearly always passed its revenues, however high the latter might be. The huge Italian debt rolled up within forty years is a proof of this unpleasant fact. It is certainly a good thing for Italians to feel that their national debt is not increasing, even if their taxation is not lessening. It is also good for commercial expansion that Italian paper money is now on a par with gold, and that the fluctuations of values which prevailed a few years ago, like those in the values of American greenbacks during the Civil War, have ceased. It is not so easy to say whether the result shows any special financial genius in the Italian Minister. A measure proposed by him just before Christmas would hardly indicate it. Signor Lucchate asked to be let reduce the rate of interest now paid on church property, bonds issued by the State in compensation for lands and other values forcibly expropriated. To reduce the rate of interest by getting offers to take the national securities by other parties at a lower rate and pay off the present holders, if they decline to accept such rates, is perfectly legitimate finance. To pick out a single class of bondholders and reduce the rate pledged to them without offering any alternative appears mere confiscation, not financial genius of any kind.

Some reform is certainly needed in Italian taxation at present. The expenses of the central government, including the army, navy, public debt and payment of officials of all kinds, consume thirty per cent. of the whole produce of the soil of Italy. Less than one-tenth of the taxation is spent on public improvements of any kind, including schools, harbors, roads and the improvement of agriculture, manufacturing industries or commerce. The letter postage in Italy is double that of the United States on domestic letters or postal cards. As the franc in Italy in common life is nearly equivalent to the dollar in America, this rate is at least six times greater than the

American postage. The number of letters sent by mail is extremely small in Italy in consequence.

In other ways the financial methods of the Italian Government seem lacking in science to a foreigner. A very large part of the revenue is from direct taxes on houses, lands and food, and its collection is both expensive and aggravating. In January the imposition of a new municipal tax in the town of Ronciglione, near Viterbo, caused an advance of thirty per cent. in the prices of bread, wine and meat. A formidable local outbreak was the result, which it needed a large military force to keep from burning the municipal buildings. At Palermo about the same time I found the prices of bread and meat regulated strictly by the city authorities. These things indicate a system of taxes not unlike that of the eighteenth century rather than the twentieth. It may be recalled that it was chiefly the abuses of that system in France that started the French Revolution. Economy in the national expenditures is apparently badly needed in order to lessen these specially dangerous forms of taxation.

It is not so easy, it must be confessed, to reduce the public expenditure, with the enormous debt and the huge army and navy. The latter certainly seems the most suitable field for retrenchment. Ironclads and their support are fearfully costly and their utility is at least highly problematical. Italy has no colonies worth speaking of to defend, and need hardly fear a naval war with any power. Its navy is wholly a creation of the modern government, and its only serious engagement with the Austrians at Lessa in 1866 showed much more the little value of armor-plated vessels against wooden ships than anything else. A cessation of activity in naval construction would seem the simplest road to reducing the crushing weight of taxation.

There does not seem to be as much peculation of the public funds in Italy as in the United States. The populations of all the towns, and even country communes, have been trained from time immemorial in the practice of local administration, and expenditures are watched with lynx eyes everywhere. There was probably a good deal of private profit made out of the public funds during the early years of the government of Victor Emmanuel, but there does not seem much of it at present. A case was going on at Rome during the last months of the past and the beginning of the present year which recalled some familiar American scandals. A former Minister, Bettolo, was accused of having used his position to give contracts for new ironclads to friends at higher prices than the material could be bought in the open market. The case attracted much attention. Its singularity was much greater in Italy than a like case would be in the United States.

It may also be said that the public sentiment in regard to the moral guilt of theft is far more marked in Italy than in America or England. This is specially so in Northern Italy, though I saw but little difference in Naples or Sicily. However, there was a good deal of talk of secret societies in the latter districts. The "Camorra" and "Mafia" of Naples and Sicily were described as societies which protected their members by underhand means against legal punishments for misdeeds. Their character was not unlike that given some years ago to the Molly Maguires in the Pennsylvania coal districts, and it was chiefly given by Italians from other sections of the peninsula. In North Italy there seemed less petty stealing than in almost any country I am acquainted with. The room doors of hotels frequented by Italians seemed always left open, and I never missed the smallest article anywhere. Men leave their baggage in apparent security at most railroad stations in country places without the formality of a receipt. The absence of police guardianship in the numerous places open to the public and stored with valuable art treasures is very striking. The churches are often filled with valuable paintings and works in silver or gold. The custom of hanging up silver *ex votos* for favors received from heaven is very common. In some churches large spaces of the walls are quite covered with them. Nevertheless these buildings are left open most of the day, and instances of theft or malicious mischief are hardly mentioned. The only case of the latter brought to my notice was the breaking of a hand on a marble statue erected by the Bishop in front of the seminary at Biella, and was committed in the excitement of Garibaldi's time. The gardens and villas of almost every Italian city seem as little liable to injury as the churches, though the police guardians are much fewer than in America. These facts seem to show a better developed moral conscience among the majority of Italians than is to be found in most northern countries. Wealth does not seem to give a higher standard of honesty, whatever other benefits it may bring materially.

The poverty of Italy as compared with France or the United States has been already referred to. Wages are scarcely above a quarter of the average in New York or Pennsylvania, and employment, even at such prices, is scarce in some districts. The number of Italian workmen who emigrate temporarily to Switzerland and Germany as well as to France in search of work is numbered by many thousands each year. It implies greater wealth and more active constructive works in these countries than in Italy. The comparative poverty of the latter country is shown in many other ways. One sees little luxury even among the wealthy classes of Rome or Naples such as is seen at Paris or London. Automobiles

and yachts are very rare in Italy; so are great public entertainments. Lack of funds is given commonly as the cause why works of public utility, as the reclamation of the waste territory around Rome, are not attempted. There are few colossal fortunes among either the commercial class or aristocracy, at least what would be considered such in America. The late Minister of Finances, Sella, was spoken of as a very wealthy man on the grounds of a fortune of twelve million lire—two and a half million dollars. The Roman Prince Borghese was said to have lost twenty-eight million lire in unlucky building speculations. It is easy to see the standard of wealth is not high in Italy.

Still the pressure of poverty does not seem to weigh very heavily in most ways on the working classes. I can certainly say that no part of Italy shows anything like the distress which was chronic in Ireland down to my own boyhood. There appears to be no lack of food for any considerable class, and the clothing, even of the poorest, is far superior to the rags one sees so often in English or Irish cities. Bare feet are common in some parts of Naples, but seemingly more as a matter of choice than of need, as among sailors and dock laborers in the United States. The housing of the working classes, even in the country parts, is mostly in solid stone buildings erected generations ago, but provided with stone stairs, substantial roofs and sufficient windows and doors. Modern conveniences are little needed, but substitutes for them have been in use in Italian buildings since the time of the Romans. In Pompeii one sees to-day the old lead water pipes jointed as a modern workman would join them, the drains, stoves, hot air pipes and wash basins with plugs which seem as if they might be taken from a modern Italian town. One scarcely finds in Italy any buildings as poor as back streets of English or American cities, and still less anything comparable to the mud cabins in which British civilization kept the Irish working classes during a hundred and fifty years of semi-starvation. The house accommodation of the Italians, it may be said, is an inheritance handed down by centuries of good building work throughout the land.

There seemed little discontent with their lot among the Italian working classes generally. Strikes occur occasionally in the northern manufacturing districts as elsewhere, but the general look of the people is cheerful. The number of emigrants who return from foreign lands, not only European, but also North and South America, is very considerable, much more proportionately than in Ireland or England. This implies an attractiveness in the home life, even with its poverty, in Italy not found elsewhere. The class known in popular terms as the "submerged tenth" in England and America

does not seem to be found in Italy. I was amused when my Piedmontese friend told me that the tramp nuisance was becoming serious in his own district. As many as three unemployed wanderers had applied to the town authorities for help within two months of the preceding winter, and he thought the fact ominous. One disgusted him by telling a plausible story, receiving a franc and returning two months later to seek another with a new story. I could not help thinking how an ordinary American Mayor would feel if his town of five thousand people had only to relieve half a dozen of wanderers in a winter.

Two characteristics of the Italians go a good way towards lessening the sufferings which poverty brings generally elsewhere. The habit of thrift seems to be innate with all classes. Houses, clothing and tools are carefully mended as long as they will hold together and serve their purpose. A stage driver in Piedmont showed me with great apparent satisfaction his waterproof cape which he had used for twenty-three years and was still good, though adorned with many seams. Nothing in the way of food for man or beast, for fuel or for any daily need is ever let go to waste. The fallen leaves of the beech trees are carefully gathered in the fall from the roads by old people and children and packed in baskets to serve as bedding for cattle. The attention given to the latter is a pleasing feature of Italian character. I saw no instance of abuse of animals during my whole stay except a tendency to pile excessive loads on beasts of burthen. Donkeys and goats share the same care from their owners as cows and horses. The first named are very widely used and command much higher prices than in England or Ireland.

The absence of drunkenness in Italy is also very striking to a visitor from America or England. Wine is consumed universally as an article of food, and wine shops are common, but one scarcely sees an intoxicated Italian anywhere. There is a certain amount of meetings in the evening in the wine shops to play cards and interchange gossip, but the consumption on these occasions is generally small. Caffes are numerous in Northern Italy, though much less so in Naples or Sicily. They usually furnish wines or brandy as well as coffee, and the great majority of customers no more think of imbibing three or four glasses of the former than of the latter. One hears an occasional disquisition from some supposed scientific authority on the dangers of alcoholism, but in practice drunkenness seems almost unknown in Italy as compared with northern lands.

Of the sentiments of Italians generally towards the existing government it is not easy to speak in language easily understood in America. Most seem to desire the continuation of the unity effected by Cavour, but few speak with any feeling of enthusiasm of

the actual administration. Loyalty to the monarchy is strongest in Piedmont, where the existing royal family has ruled for many centuries, and on the whole with popular good will. Devotion to monarchy in the abstract, such as is expressed by most Englishmen, is little expressed anywhere outside Piedmont. In Tuscany and Venezia, and indeed most parts of North Italy, the popular traditions all turn towards old republican institutions, though few think of reviving them in practice. In Naples and Sicily there seems to be general indifference to what may be the form of government. There is, however, a good deal of complaint that these provinces are badly treated in the expenditure of the public funds and that the lion's share falls to the Italians of the north. The Italian feeling of loyalty to the monarchy does not seem by any means as strong as the English. The army is by no means as much under the control of the King as in Prussia. The soldiers, as in France, seem much more close to the general population than in England or Germany. There is little of the class militarism among either officers or soldiers that exists in the latter countries, and even less than in the small army of the United States. Whether this be useful or not I do not undertake to say; I merely state the fact.

The military police or carabinieri are certainly a fine body of men and generally popular. Even in repressing riots or arresting criminals their methods are much gentler than those of American police officers. Clubbing is unknown and even shaking or laying hands on individuals without absolute necessity is very rare. Most of the municipalities of any size have also their own police force, which is differently uniformed in each city. Generally speaking, there is little interference with the public by police in any part of Italy. It is far less than in England and almost infinitely less than in Ireland. The carabinieri of Italy number about thirty thousand, or less than one for each thousand of the population. The Irish constabulary, with the Dublin police force, also under government direct control, numbers about fourteen thousand for a population of four and a half millions. It is rather more than three times the proportion in Italy. The popularity enjoyed by the Italian police among all classes is in funny contrast with the feelings of the Irish people towards their peelers.

The penal code of modern Italy is very severe in its provisions. It was mainly the work of the late Minister Zanardelli, who threw into it the zeal of a politician for centralization and the cold calculation of a theoretician lawyer. Complaints of its harshness, especially towards petty offenses, I heard alike in Piedmont and in Naples from men who had no prejudice against the general government. Men once convicted, it seems are obliged to carry afterwards a kind

of ticket of leave setting forth the quality of their offense and their conduct in prison. This document has to be exhibited every time its bearer is seeking employment. The effect in increasing the number of criminals, especially in Southern Italy, where the people had never been used to the Code Napoleon, as in the northern districts, was said to be considerable. The feelings of the working classes in Naples towards the law generally are not unlike those of the Irish peasantry towards British legal administration.

Though the first newspapers of Europe appeared in Venice, and the Italian name for such has been carried into most other languages, the press does not exert as much influence as in England or America. It may be that long familiarity has taught the educated classes in Italy to place moderate reliance on oracles based on an experience of twenty-four hours only. The Italian papers are small and nearly all sold for a cent, or at most two. The most influential papers are not those published in Rome or Naples. The *Corriere* and *Avanti*, of Milan, and the *Stampa*, of Turin, are more attended to than any Roman journal, even in the capital. As regards the contents the Italian papers are fairly well arranged both for foreign and local news. The editorial columns of the better class show superior knowledge and literary taste to the general American press in matters of history, art and literature. In political and commercial news there is less difference. The huge Sunday editions in vogue in America would be looked on as sinful waste of raw material by any Italian. They take papers for the daily news, not as encyclopædias. There is less sensationalism in the Italian press than either the English, American or French. The *Avanti*, of Milan, towards the end of last year made a fierce attack on Rosati, a member of the new Ministry of Giolitti. It charged him with the unscrupulous use of methods like those with which the late Senator Morton was credited at the time of the Tilden election. The charges did not go as far as those against the recent Republican Governor of Kentucky, but they had influence enough to drive Rosati to suicide a few days after the formation of the Ministry. Journalistic attacks of this kind, however, are much rarer in Italy than in the United States.

Primary schools are well extended in the northern part of Italy. The day school is an institution known there some centuries before the invention of printing. The earliest historian of Florence enumerates several thousand scholars in the schools for reading and writing in Florence of the thirteenth century. School methods received much attention and distinguished teachers of the young enjoyed high honor in Lombardy in the fifteenth century. The Italians, however, have not the same simple faith in the efficacy of

schools for the sufficient training of the population in every way that is felt in American cities. The duty of parents to supplement the teachings of the school room by those of home is more fully recognized by nearly all educated Italians. There is also much more importance attached to training in morals, religion and manners than is given to those subjects in America or England. I had an opportunity to see the home training given to young children in the home of my host in Piedmont, and it was certainly attractive. An evening or two after my arrival I was asked to visit the children's chapel when the three little ones were about to retire. It was filled up with a little altar adorned like that of a church, and the three children repeated their prayers very seriously and sang one or two simple hymns before it on their knees. The eldest boy of five then went through an imitation of the Benediction service of the Church with a toy monstrance and the deepest gravity, after which he gravely extinguished the lights and the three filed out of the room silently. Sacred pictures and statues are common gifts to children, and they seemed early taught to treat them with a respect very different from that given their ordinary play toys. This system seemed quite common in the homes of Northern Italy.

The day schools in the little country towns were well filled, though the children seemed generally younger than the average in America. Italian Sisters of Charity had charge of the municipal school for young girls and boys. Teachers for the others were appointed by the Town Council, though the provincial prefect, as representative of the central government, had some voice in the matter and in the courses of instruction. There was at least one priest among the school teachers. He was a canon of the parish church, and had sufficient time at his disposal to fill the functions. I was told that the Bishop of Biella required candidates for ordination to obtain certificates as primary teachers before receiving Holy Orders in his diocese. There seemed little clash in the primary schools of Piedmont, at least between the government and the Church authorities.

In the higher education, especially in the universities, the action of the Ministry is much more absolute. Italy has been the parent of European university education. The Universities of Salerno, Bologna and Padua are the oldest in Europe, and the organized teaching of law and medicine had its beginning in their schools. Italy at the time of its formation into the modern kingdom was more fully provided with universities and academies than any other European land. Their efficiency seems shown by the number of great Italian names in science of every branch during the last four centuries. Nearly every one of the modern physical sciences—geology, chemistry, optics, scientific botany, anatomy and electricity

—are traced to an origin in Italian schools. The names of Da Vinci, Galileo, Toricelli, Galvani, Volta, Matteucci and Secchi are evidence of the thoroughness of Italian scientific culture under its old university system. The universities shared the diversity of character of the sections to which they belonged. Padua excelled in medical studies, Salerno and Bologna in legal, Florence in literature and history. The new government, in pursuance of its general policy, has brought all the universities under the control of a Minister of Public Instruction, who lays down a cast-iron system of obligatory courses in every branch of knowledge for all alike. At Venice and Turin, at Rome, Palermo and Naples the same lessons and textbooks are imposed by ministerial decree. Early this year much disturbance in the universities was caused by a decree of the Minister of Public Instruction issued just before the downfall of the Zanardelli Ministry. It changed the subjects of the courses in law of the universities, suddenly transferring those of the first year to the second or third and vice versa, while still demanding attendance at twenty full courses as an absolute necessity for admission to the legal profession. Protests were made on every side by the professors and rectors, but with what result I cannot say.

The turning of the Italian universities from centres of independent intellectual culture in each part of the country into mere training schools for the professions and government offices seems a serious danger to the national intelligence. It is none the less so because it is introduced in the name of modern science and improved discipline. A cast-iron rule follows the students from the lycei to their final admission to professional life and leaves little or no time for independent studies, such as have given such glorious fruit in Italy during the past four centuries. Nearly all the graduates in law and medicine, it must be added, become candidates for positions under the government after passing through their courses in the universities. These are barred absolutely to all but the graduates marked with State approval; no matter what the acquirements or talents of one who has acquired knowledge outside the State schools, he is not allowed to practice professionally or to share in the public offices. The students in the colleges still conducted by the religious orders, as those of the Jesuits at Mondragone or Monaco, are thus debarred from most avenues of professional life. The modern system is largely moulded on the centralized methods established in France by Napoleon I., and which have hardly raised the intellectual standards of France to any notable degree. In Italy itself it is instructive to compare the intellectual progress achieved during the last six centuries in the kingdom of Naples, occupying nearly half the country and the cluster of small independent States—Florence,

Lucca, Sienna, Pisa, Genoa, Venice, Milan and Padua, which divided the soil of North Italy. The comparison does not tell much for centralization in an intellectual point.

The religious conditions of modern Italy and the attitude of its government towards the Church seem hardly well understood among either Catholics or non-Catholics in the United States. I will only try to give such facts as I found during my residence, and the deductions that seem to flow from them. In the country districts of Piedmont where I traveled there seemed little difference between the attitude of the bulk of the people towards the Church and that of the Catholic counties in Ireland. Nearly every one attended Mass on Sundays and holy days as a matter of course, and the attendance at the daily Masses, which began very early (much before 6 A. M.), was much larger than in Ireland. The attitude of the congregations was everywhere serious and devotional and the numbers approaching the sacraments very large. I was much impressed by the way in which the Piedmontese congregations took an active part in the public services. The prayers after Mass and the alternate verses of the Vespers were repeated by nearly every one aloud in correct Latin and musical harmony. The chant was mostly Gregorian. I was present at the even service on the festival of the patron saint of Masserano, which was observed strictly as a public holiday. The psalms chanted were distinct from the ordinary Vespers, yet fully half the congregation chanted all the responses in good Latin. This implies an amount of true mental culture really remarkable among a remote country population.

There were daily services for the dead all through November in every country church. In the evening they generally closed with the Litany for Souls Departed and Benediction. All sang the responses to both with deep fervor. It was most impressive in the dim light of a November evening to hear two or three hundred voices reëcho the petitions formulated by the priest, "Sancte Stephane ora pro eis" and "Omnes sancti martyres orate pro eis." The churches generally had no lights except around the altar. The deep chant rolled back from the gloom of the nave where hundreds knelt motionless.

Pilgrimages to shrines consecrated to special devotions are a common form of devotion in Northern Italy. They recall in a way the old "Patrons" of the Irish Catholics and the famous St. Patrick's Purgatory in Ulster. I was asked by my host to visit the sanctuary of Our Lady of Oropa, about forty miles from Turin, and we walked there from Biella up a steep but well-made road. The sanctuary contains a small wooden statue of the Blessed Virgin brought from Palestine in the fourth century by St. Eusebius, the martyr Bishop of Vercelli under the Arian successors of Constantine. On special

feasts twenty thousand pilgrims climb the steep road to offer public prayers at this shrine, and many spend some days there on retreats of more or less duration. For their lodging a palace-like collection of buildings has been gradually built, and free lodging in good rooms, with bed, bedding, etc., is given free on demand to all. The hospice is in a gorge of the lower Alps, about four thousand feet above the sea level. The buildings are of granite, solidly built and seven stories high on the front. They run back nearly seven hundred feet in two lines about a hundred and fifty feet apart, crossed by transverse buildings into courts. I was told they can accommodate ten thousand pilgrims at once. Additions to the buildings are being constantly made by private offerings. A glorious domed church three hundred and twenty feet high to the top of the cross and a hundred and forty feet in diameter is now being slowly raised up here among the mountains at nearly the altitude of Mount Washington. The faith which accomplishes such works must be a living fact.

Varallo Sezia, about forty miles from Oropa, has a sanctuary of another kind which is as remarkable in its way. On the top of a mountain six or seven hundred feet above the town and reached by a narrow and rocky road a space of about thirty or forty acres has been devoted to a kind of panorama of the scenes of Our Lord's life on earth. There are forty-three chapels devoted each to a particular fact of Our Lord's earthly career, His birth at Bethlehem, calling of the Apostles, the Passion and Crucifixion. The chapels are of various forms and sizes, but each is filled with groups of statuary backed by wall and ceiling paintings so as to form perfect tableaux like the grouping of actors on a stage. Most of the figures are in wood or gesso, artificial stone, and colored. Some of the greatest Italian artists, including Gaudenzio Ferrari, the friend of Raffaele, have worked on these chapels, and the effects in some are almost marvelous. The Transfiguration especially is wonderful. As at Oropa new additions are being made to the buildings at Varallo. The central church has been finished within the last few years in Mosaic and marble at the cost of an Italian gentleman. The doors of bronze are very fine.

The devotion of all classes to these shrines is very marked. I found records at Oropa of visits by several members of the Sardinian royal family in the past. The late King Umberto was among them, as well as his brother, the ex-King of Spain. The King also I found credited with a devotional visit to the Church of the Blessed Sacrament at Orvieto a few years ago and with a contribution towards the completion of its noble façade.

In the Italian cities the churches were also well filled and large

numbers approached the sacraments. At Milan on Sunday evening a sermon was preached at which I saw about five thousand in attendance, nearly half of them men. The early Masses on week-days before day were also quite largely attended. It was nearly the same at Florence and Venice, possibly even more so at the latter. The intense interest felt by the Milanese, Venetians and Florentines in their respective cathedrals seems a genuine patriotism much deeper than political enthusiasm. The cult of the patron saints of St. Ambrose at Milan, San Marco at Venice, San Antonino at Florence and San Gennaro at Naples is of a similar kind. Padua is full of memories of Saint Anthony, and his basilica is the central feature of the city. St. Catherine holds like sway at cultured Sienna to-day.

Donations for religious purposes are more common by far in modern Italy than most strangers are aware of. The shrines of Oropa and Varallo have been mentioned. The façade of the Basilica of Orvieto, the most beautiful architectural exterior I have yet seen, is quite modern in much of its detail. Magnificent bronze doors, costing half a million francs, were placed in the Duomo at Florence a little before my arrival. Of more private donations for distinctly religious objects I was told that the Bishop of a single diocese in Piedmont holds four million francs in trust for perpetual Masses for the dead founded since the time of Cavour.

The way in which the religious orders have largely returned to their old abodes since the general laws for their suppression in Italy is very instructive. The famous Convent of San Marco, at Florence, was confiscated and made a national monument more than thirty years ago, yet I found the white-robed Children of St. Dominic officiating there quite undisturbed. Franciscans, Dominicans, Passionists, Sisters of Charity and members of other religious orders are to be met everywhere through Italy. It would seem that the hostility towards them on the part of the government had little other motive than the vulgar one of getting hold of their temporal property. In many cases the convents have been bought back like that of the Camaldoli at Naples, and the authorities seem quite satisfied to leave the members to follow their rules in peace. Even the majority of the politicians have none of that bitter hostility to the Christian religion which is found among the infidel element in France or Germany or the half-Protestant, half-agnostic public of England or the United States. Sella, the Finance Minister of Victor Emmanuel, was buried at his own desire under the sanctuary of Oropa. Mass is daily said in a private chapel of the Pantheon for the souls of Victor Emmanuel and Umberto.

All these things indicate a strong vitality in the Church in Italy

to-day. Its moral power is not denied by any Italian, though political interests are supposed to be involved in keeping it in check instead of aiding its moral influence over the people. It is not easy to map out the future, but it certainly looks as though the somewhat shaky equilibrium of the modern Italian State needed imperatively a greater moral force for its permanence than can be obtained from political action or so-called scientific statesmanship. It is just thirty-three years since Victor Emmanuel entered Rome as King of Italy. It is nearly sixteen hundred since Galla Placidia raised the basilica where St. Paul's body still rests. Time is with the Popes and the Church in Italy to-day.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

Rome, Italy.

THE MORALITY OF THE AIMS AND METHODS OF THE LABOR UNION.

THE great anthracite coal strike of 1902 forced the American people to realize more clearly and more acutely than ever before the power of organized labor. The interest thus aroused has been increased, both in extent and intensity, by the subsequent activity of unionism and the wider publicity given its principles and methods. The demands for higher wages and other industrial advantages have seemingly been larger and more frequent than at any previous period; the proportion of the demands granted has likewise been exceptional; the membership of labor organizations has grown at a remarkable rate, so that it is now reckoned at between two and two and one-half millions; the methods of certain labor leaders have brought them into unfavorable notoriety, and the use of violence in strikes has been all too prominent; finally, certain fundamental assumptions, such as the right of the unionists to be dealt with as organizations, the right to refuse to work with non-unionists, the right to exercise some control over the dismissal of employes and over other conditions of work, have been frankly claimed and energetically defended. In consequence of these and numerous similar facts, the labor union has been the subject of very general discussion and of not a little criticism. It has been examined from the viewpoint of the welfare of the laborer, the employer, the consumer and society. Its ethical aspect, however, has received the greater share of attention. We are constantly being told that this or that particular method or claim of the unions is "right" or "wrong," "just" or "unjust," "fair" or "unfair," "justi-

fiable" or "unjustifiable." In the ethical portion of the discussion, however, two questions that should be kept distinct have frequently been confused, namely: Is it right that the labor union should exist? and, are its characteristic methods free from moral censure? Since the labor union is, like any other human association, neither good nor bad in itself, the first of these questions can be answered only by ascertaining the morality of the end at which the labor union aims, while the second becomes an inquiry into the means employed to reach that end.

THE LABOR UNION'S AIMS.

The purposes of the labor union are, briefly, two: to give pecuniary aid to members in time of sickness, accident or unemployment, and to secure better conditions of employment than would be possible if the men acted as individuals. The first of these aims is much the less important, and tends year by year to occupy an ever smaller place in labor union consciousness. Indeed, the mutual insurance feature must, as Sidney and Beatrice Webb observe, be regarded, "not as the end or object, but as one of the methods of Trade Unionism." (*"Industrial Democracy,"* p. 165.) The common funds of the association are used chiefly to support members who are out of work because of a strike or lockout. Thus the mutual insurance afforded is for the most part only against the necessity of accepting unfavorable terms from the employer. The first aim tends to become subordinate to the second, a mere means, a method of securing or retaining industrial advantages. Therefore, the justification of the labor union as an institution turns upon the morality of combining to get higher wages, shorter hours or other economic advantages, and of resisting the efforts of the employer to reduce the laborer's present position in any of these respects.

Laborers have a moral right to unite to obtain better terms from their employers if this action would involve no injustice to either employer or consumer. They may, for example, rightly combine to get higher wages when these would not be unfair wages. But if they are at present receiving all the remuneration to which they are morally entitled their action is wrong and unjust. For men have no more right as an organization than as individuals to "better their condition" by causing other men to enter into an extortionate contract. What is true of wages applies also to the length of the working day and the other conditions of employment that are commonly at issue between master and man. Again, if the purpose of the organization be merely to enable its members to retain present advantages that are fair the union will be morally good. It will

be unlawful only when the members enjoy conditions that are in excess of the requirements of justice. Hence, whether the union aims at making things better or preventing them from being made worse, it will be justifiable only on condition that its members have a right, as against either employers or consumers, to the object sought.

This reasoning assumes that there is an element of justice in the labor contract. Neither employer nor employé may exact from the other all that he can, but only as much as is his right. Owing to the prevalence of false theories of politics and rights, this elementary truth has been, and still is, too frequently ignored. Professor Sidgwick confesses that during the greater part of the nineteenth century political economy as well as the business world assumed that a contract made without force or fraud was generally a fair contract. This extraordinary theory of contractual justice would justify alike the starvation wages of the sweat shop and the extortionate prices of the most tyrannous monopoly. If it were sound the question of the morality of labor union aims would be idle and irrelevant. Whatever the unions could obtain without fraud or force they would have a right to take. They could be condemned only on grounds of expediency. Happily, there is in progress a very general reaction from this immoral doctrine, and almost all men now admit that there is a fair price and an unfair price for labor, as well as for all other goods that men buy and sell. The world is returning to the concept of "just price," which the economist, as Professor Ashley tells us, "has been accustomed to regard as quite out of place in political economy," but which in the ages of Faith was elaborated with scientific precision and carried fairly well into practice throughout the Christian world. Interwoven with all the criticisms of labor unions is the assumption and frequently the explicit assertion that they are asking not merely what is unwise, but what is unjust.

Now it is the general belief of all classes of men, a small section of employers excepted, that the laborer of to-day receives less than his just share of wealth and opportunity. The organized struggle of the laboring classes, says John Graham Brooks, "assumes that the present competitive wage system does not bring justice to labor," and he adds that "our society is full of extremely influential persons who say point blank that labor's protest is in the main a righteous one and should prevail," ("The Social Unrest," p. 154.) In proof of the latter statement he quotes a large list of these "influential persons," beginning with Wagner, the composer, and ending with Leo XIII. Although the determination of the laborer's just share of economic and social goods is neither so simple nor so easy

as is frequently assumed, the general conviction just mentioned is undoubtedly correct. Reference is had, of course, to the laboring class as a whole, not to a small highly paid section; for it seems sufficiently clear that some groups of workmen receive at present a wage that meets all the requirements of justice, and consequently that any attempt on their part, whether by organization or otherwise, to exact more favorable conditions would be an act of injustice. Even in the case of these, however, the labor union will usually be necessary in order that effectual resistance may be offered to those forces that tend to reduce the position of labor below an equitable level.

In order to realize these aims the labor union is not only justified but indispensable. Unbiased and well informed men no longer accept the complacent and utterly gratuitous theory of Bastiat and his school concerning the beautiful compensations and harmonies of unlimited competition. Natural economic forces do not tend automatically and inevitably to a continuous betterment of the position of the laborer. It has been proved by abundant and bitter experience that the unchecked tendencies of the industrial world all point in the opposite direction. So conservative a writer as the late Francis A. Walker declared almost thirty years ago that there was no virtue, no tendency even, in strictly industrial forces to make good the loss caused by specific instances of unemployment, wage reductions or other labor misfortunes. (See "The Wages Question," ch. iv.) Fifteen years later we find him writing: "Nothing, economically speaking, can save industrial society from progressive degradation except the spirit and power of the working classes to resist being crowded down." ("Elementary Course in Political Economy," p. 266.) The fact is that, instead of being endowed with the fatalistic character that is still too frequently attributed to them, economic forces are for the most part created and controlled by the human beings that compose economic society; and if the laborer leaves their direction entirely in the hands of the consumer and the employer his economic position must grow steadily worse. The consumer generally cares only for cheap goods, and even with the best intentions cannot, merely as a consumer, do much to check this tendency. The majority of employers are neither sufficiently benevolent, sufficiently far-sighted nor, in a régime of sharp competition, sufficiently powerful to afford the laborer adequate protection. No entire class or industrial grade of laborers has ever secured or retained any important economic advantage except by its own aggressiveness and its own powers of resistance, brought to bear upon the employer through the medium of force (economic) or fear. It is not denied that individual employers have voluntarily bettered the

condition of their employés, or willingly refrained from making it worse; but these instances are exceptions and, considering the whole number of employers and the entire history of the wage system, rare exceptions. Now, it is obvious that the alertness, the aggressiveness, to seize and make the most of opportunities for advancement, the energy and power to resist being crowded down, can be made efficacious only when crystallized in organizations. This *a priori* expectation has been realized in experience. The labor union has secured large gains not only for the employés of single establishments, but for entire groups of workers, and it has probably been even more effectual in preventing losses. To quote the United States Industrial Commission: "An overwhelming preponderance of testimony before the Industrial Commission indicates that the organization of labor has resulted in a marked improvement in the economic condition of the workers. . . . And it is regarded by several witnesses as an influence of great importance in moderating the severity of depression and diminishing its length." ("Final Report of the Industrial Commission," pp. 802, 804.)

THE LABOR UNION'S METHODS.

I. THE STRIKE.—Both in its general effects upon the community and in the place that it occupies in the minds of workingmen, this is the most important of labor union methods. Even when it is carried on without violation of the rights of any one, it usually causes losses more or less grave to employer, employé and the general public. It has, moreover, a strong tendency to foment the passions of anger and hatred, and it puts before the workers temptations to physical force that cannot easily be resisted. In view of these facts, commonsense and respect for the moral law dictate that a strike should not be resorted to unless three conditions are verified, namely: that a peaceful solution of the difficulty has been found ineffective; that the grievance is great in proportion to the inconveniences that are liable to result, and that there is a reasonable hope that the strike will be successful. Of course, it is always understood that the strike is on behalf of some advantage to which the laborers have a right. Where any one of these conditions is wanting, the calling of a strike will be unjustifiable and immoral.

Two of the subordinate methods—subordinate because in nearly all cases incident to the strike—that are sometimes employed by union workmen (and others likewise) are violence and the sympathetic strike. Concerning the prevalence of the former practice, there is a great deal of exaggeration in the public press, and especially in the statements of some employers. For example, the executive committee of the recently formed "Citizens' Industrial Asso-

ciation" asserted a few months ago that within the last few years "the cases are innumerable in which workingmen have been disabled and murdered." If words are to be accepted in their ordinary sense this assertion is simply false. John Mitchell maintains that the amount of violence in strikes is infinitesimal when compared with that which attends the ordinary course of life. "After all, violence is a less common accompaniment of labor disputes than is often supposed." ("Final Report of Industrial Commission," p. 879.) Within recent years there has been a considerable improvement in this matter—an improvement both in the attitude of the leaders and in the conduct of the workers. Nevertheless, it seems to be even now true to say that the use of physical force in strikes is not of the nature of a rare exception. The conclusion seems reasonable that a large proportion of workingmen believe that they have a moral right to use this method both against the intractable employer and against the laborers who would take their places. They seem to claim a certain "right to their jobs." They quit these with the expectation of resuming them when their demands shall have been conceded, and they seem to hold that the employer and the so-called "scab" are in the position of men attempting to deprive them of their rights. They conclude, therefore, that they are justified in meeting this aggression with the weapons of might, just as they would resist an attack on their persons or property by robbers.

In this claim which we suppose the laborer to make there are two distinct issues which, though often found together, are separable both in logic and in the world of reality. The first is the laborer's right to his job, while the second is his right to just conditions of employment. The latter right can exist in the absence of the former, and both might be valid without conferring on the laborer the right to defend them by force. Moreover, it is clear that even though there be no such thing as a right to a job, both the employer who discharges his men without just cause and the workers who strike without a real grievance will be guilty of violating charity.

Does the laborer possess this so-called right to his job? The question, of course, concerns moral, not legal rights. The Abbé Naudet strongly maintains that such a right exists in the case of skilled laborers. These men have spent a considerable time in learning their present trade, and cannot readily become acquainted with another equally remunerative. The civil law should guarantee them a right to their avocation (*propriété de la profession*) similar to that which the officer enjoys with regard to his rank in the army. The skilled laborer performs, after a costly apprenticeship, a duty to society, and in return has a right to receive adequate protection in his position. ("*Propriété, Capital, et Travail*," pp. 383-390.) The

Abbé Naudet would vindicate this right of the skilled man as against the unskilled, even in the case of a job for which both are competing and which neither has previously held. Whatever may be said about this particular class, the reasons for asserting that *some* workmen have a right to remain in their present employment as long as they conduct themselves reasonably are much stronger than is commonly assumed. And they are based not merely on the principles of social or legal justice, but have to do with the justice that exists between men as individuals. Here is a laborer with a family and owning perhaps the home in which he lives. If he loses his present position, he must either accept a much less remunerative job or leave the city. Certainly it seems in accordance with not only the spirit, but the accepted principles of justice to say that if this man is discharged without reasonable cause the injury done him amounts to a violation of his rights. There is, indeed, no obligation issuing immediately either from the natural law or the wage contract binding the employer to keep this particular man on his pay roll, but such an obligation seems to flow mediately from the conjunction of law and contract. The laborer has a natural right to enjoy reasonable conditions of existence. This abstract right takes, on the occasion of the wage contract, the concrete form of a right to reasonable security of position, as well as a right to fair wages. If we compare the right thus claimed with the right of the first occupant to a given portion of land we shall see that it is not essentially different from or essentially inferior to the latter. The first arrival on a piece of land has, in common with other men, a natural right to live from the produce of the earth, and, as a corollary of this, a right to hold a portion of the earth as his private property. But he has no immediate natural right to the *particular section* of the earth that he has seized. There is nothing in the nature of this land nor in his own nature which would dictate that he should have it rather than his neighbor, who arrived a little later. How comes it, then, that, according to all Catholic moralists and the practically unanimous usage of all peoples, the land belongs to the first comer rather than to the second? Simply because this arrangement is reasonable. The indeterminate, general and abstract right which by nature every man has to private property must, if men are to live reasonably together, become determinate, particular and concrete in some reasonable way; and one of the reasonable ways is by assigning validity and sacredness to the contingent fact of first occupancy. On precisely the same principles the laborer that we are considering seems to have a right to his job. His indeterminate and abstract right to private property in the goods that are essential to right living is for the present converted into the determinate and

concrete right to fair wages from this particular employer, and it would seem that the latter right is not properly and reasonably safeguarded, does not, indeed, contain all that is involved in the right to a reasonable living, unless it includes the further right to continue to receive these wages as long as he honestly earns them and the employer is able to pay them. True, there is nothing in the nature of things to suggest or require that John Jones should continue to employ John Smith, but neither is there anything in the nature of things obliging John Brown to recognize the right of John White to a particular piece of land. What the natural law and natural justice obliges Brown to respect is White's right to some private property; and through the contingent fact of first occupancy this general right has been transformed into the particular right in question. Similarly, the right of John Smith to the private property that is necessary for reasonable life has been transformed into the right to a particular job. Both rights are finally determined and in a sense created by contingent facts, which derive their entire moral and juridical value from the circumstance that they afford a reasonable method of concreting and safeguarding individual rights.

Hasty and unqualified denials of the right to a job are usually based on the assumption that a contract cannot give rise to any obligation of justice that is not expressly set down in the contract itself. If this theory were true, the employer would be bound to pay a living wage only when he had agreed to do so. The fact is that special relations—mere propinquity of various kinds—create special obligations, not merely of charity, but of justice. Americans have duties of justice to one another that they do not owe to foreigners. Brown is obliged to recognize White's right to a definite portion of a newly discovered territory because the latter is already in possession, but he may take any other part of the land that he chooses, regardless of the wishes of Green, who has not yet arrived; Jones is obliged to protect Smith's right to a decent living by paying him a living wage, but he is not obliged to do likewise with respect to Johnson, who is not in his employ. In the use of his faculties and of the goods of the earth, every man is bound in justice to respect the rights of every other living soul, which means in the concrete relations of life, not that he is to concern himself about the rights of all mankind in precisely the same degree—to refrain, for example, from occupying a tract of land because somewhere on the globe there exists a fellow-man whose property rights are unrealized—but it means that he is to give special attention to the claims of those with whom he comes into immediate contact, and whose rights, consequently, are more directly affected and more likely to be violated by his conduct. Propinquity in a hundred ways creates, fixes

and limits men's concrete rights because only in this way can indeterminate and conflicting claims be reconciled. The reasonable conclusion from this long discussion seems to be that men who are performing their tasks efficiently and to whom discharge will bring very grave inconvenience have a right to their jobs that differs in degree only from the right to a living wage and the right to land because of first occupancy.

From this principle it follows that the employer has a corresponding right to the services of his employés as long as he treats them justly. They do him an injustice if they leave him without a reasonable cause. A sufficient reason would be, for example, the desire to remove to another locality, or to get better wages at some other kind of work. In large establishments, however, changes of this nature would usually be made by the men individually and at different times, and consequently would not cause the employer serious inconvenience. It very seldom happens that the entire group of men in a given business quit their employer in a body with a view to getting employment elsewhere. Almost always their intention is to get back the old jobs when they shall have secured some advantage. Assuming that they have no just grievance, the loss inflicted on the employer by this interruption of work will in itself constitute an act of injustice. The reason that the employer has, within the limits indicated, a right to the continued services of his men is precisely the same as that on which rests the right of employés, also within due limits, to their jobs, namely, the right to the requisites of reasonable living, as modified by the facts of relationship and environment. In view of these considerations it would seem that Carroll D. Wright was mistaken when a few months ago he declared with reference to a miner who had been wantonly discharged that employés have not only a legal but a moral right to quit work whenever they choose, and that the employer enjoys the corresponding right arbitrarily to dismiss.

The second assumption upon which strikers sometimes seem to base a right to use violence is the right to just conditions of employment. We have said that this right could exist even in the absence of the right to a job. But the question naturally arises, and is in fact often asked: How can this right, which is in a general way valid, have any bearing on the positions that the strikers have vacated? or affect in any way a man who is no longer their employer? They must try to secure their rights in a wage contract with some one else, since their former master has no further relations with nor obligations to them. The answer to this presentation of the matter is that it is too simple, too theoretical to represent the facts of actual life. Few, indeed, are the strikes in which there is

such a complete severance of the old wage relations. Even in the case of strikes that fail the great majority of the workers involved usually go back to their former places. New men are not taken in sufficient numbers to carry on the work alone, and not all of them are retained permanently. Some of them, indeed, never intended to remain beyond the strike period, nor does the employer desire them any longer. These are the "professional strike breakers," men of great animal courage and recklessness, whose character and antecedents make them unsuitable as permanent employés. Of course, these men are not engaged in every strike, nor do they ever form more than a small minority of those taking the places of the strikers. At any rate, the general fact is that both employer and strikers fully expect that the great majority of the latter will finally get back their old jobs; consequently the effort of the employer is in *the concrete* an attempt to compel the men to return to work on his terms. If these terms are unjust, the employer and those who coöperate with him by taking the places of the former employés are in very fact engaged in an attack on the rights of at least as many of the latter as will resume their old jobs.

In these cases, and a fortiori on the assumption that the men have a right to their places, are not the employer and the new workers acting the part of unjust aggressors, whom it is licit, within due limits, to resist by force? This is the question that many laborers seem to answer in the affirmative. The Abbé Pottier would turn the problem over to wiser minds, but declares that the use of force will certainly not be justifiable unless three conditions are verified, namely: that there be no less objectionable means by which the strikers can obtain justice; that this particular means be efficacious, and that the good to be derived from it be great and certain in proportion to the evils that will ensue. ("De Jure et Justitia," pp, 208, 209.) In America, at any rate, the last condition is never realized. The wrongs endured by labor are insignificant when compared with the disorders that would follow any recognition of the claim that violence is lawful in justifiable strikes. That the State does not, or cannot, protect the laborer's natural right to a living wage, just as it protects his right to security of life, limb and property, is to be regretted, but the private use of force to defend the former would bring about a condition of veritable anarchy. It would be equivalent to a rebellion against existing political institutions, and consequently could be justified only in the conditions that justify rebellion. Now, conditions of this force and magnitude are most certainly not created by either the exactions of capital or the sufferings of labor. Evils of equal importance are tolerated by the law in every civilized society, yet no one maintains that they ought to be

abolished by private violence. The use of it to redress the grievances of labor cannot be too severely condemned.

The sympathetic strike is of two kinds—against another employer than the one concerned in the original dispute, or against the latter by a section of his employés having no personal grievance. An example of the first occurs when brickmakers quit work because their employer persists in furnishing material to a building contractor whose men are on strike. Their sole purpose is to embarrass the contractor and compel him to concede the demands of his own employés. It is, of course, clear that the brickmakers have committed an act of injustice if they have violated a contract requiring them to remain at work for a definite period. Even in the absence of any contract, their action will be, generally speaking, contrary to the law of charity and likewise contrary to justice. It is in violation of charity because it shows a want of Christian consideration for the welfare of the innocent employer, and it sins against justice because it inflicts upon him a grave loss without sufficient reason. As stated above, employer and employé are too intimately dependent upon each other in the realization of their natural rights to make *arbitrary* severance of their relations consistent with justice. Employés have no right to cause their employer to suffer on behalf of men who are mistreated by some one else. No doubt there are extreme cases in which the outside employer is bound in charity to assist strikers by refraining from doing business with the man against whom they have struck, but these are rare. On the other hand, when the sympathetic strike affects only the employer concerned in the original strike, it will sometimes be not merely licit, but laudable. For example, if the "common laborers" in a business have quit work on account of oppressive conditions, the skilled workers might do a good action by striking on behalf of their fellow employés. The obligations owed by the skilled men to their employer would yield before the claims of the laborers whom he is treating unjustly. Their position is analogous to that of one nation extending aid to another in resisting the unjust aggressions of a third. The case of France assisting the American colonists to throw off the yoke of England furnishes a good example. The obligation of remaining at peace with the oppressive nation does not extend so far as to render illicit all sympathetic action. Similarly, a disinterested spectator may come to the relief of a weak man who is suffering at the hands of a strong one. The case for the sympathetic strike becomes clearer when we remember that a single labor union frequently includes men performing very dissimilar tasks. They agree to act as a unit in defending not only the rights and interests of the whole body, but those of every section of it.

Hence a strike of all the employés of a given employer may be called to redress the grievances of a small proportion. If the cause is a just one, this action will usually be lawful and frequently commendable; for it is becoming more and more evident that only by this means can the weaker laborers, the great army of the unskilled, obtain adequate protection.

2. THE BOYCOTT.—Although the boycott is usually begun on the occasion of a strike, it is frequently continued long after the strike has failed. It seems, therefore, worthy of a place among the labor union's primary methods. In essence it consists of a refusal to have business or social intercourse with a certain person or persons. If the cause on behalf of which it is instituted is just, it will, within due limits, likewise be just, provided that it is used solely against those who are acting unjustly. Cardinal Gibbons recommended a boycott not long ago when, in a sermon in the Cathedral in Baltimore, he asked the people of that city not to patronize clothing manufacturers who had their goods made in "sweat shops." This would be a boycott entirely unconnected with a strike, and it would be justifiable in view of the intolerable conditions that he wished to remove. But the boycott must always be kept within the limits of fairness and charity. It must be free from all violence and threats of violence, and it must not be carried so far as to deny to the boycotted what the theologians call the "*communia signa charitatis*." By this phrase are meant those social acts that are dictated by the most fundamental of human relations—those manifestations and tokens of common humanity which man owes to his fellows, even to his deadliest enemy, from the simple fact that they *are* his fellows. Hence the boycott is carried to immoral lengths when it comprises a refusal to give or to sell the necessities of life, or any other action of equivalent harshness. With these reservations, and in the hypothesis of a just cause, the boycott may become licit both against the unjust employer and against the workingmen who will not strike or who take the strikers' places. Lehmkuhl says that laborers who are contending for a living wage may use *moral* force against workers that refuse to coöperate with them, to the extent of denying to the latter all except the fundamental forms of intercourse above described. ("*Theologia Moralis*," Vol. I., No. 1119.) Mueller lays down the same principle. ("*Theologia Moralis*," Vol. II., p. 594, 8th edition.)

This is the "primary" boycott. There is another form, called by the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission the "secondary" boycott, and by the United States Industrial Commission the "compound" boycott, which consists in a refusal of intercourse with innocent third persons who are unwilling to join in the primary boycott. This

form has been condemned by both of the bodies just mentioned, and rightly, for in all except extreme cases it constitutes an offense against Christian charity. To be sure, men may licitly persuade or try to persuade outsiders to assist them in a just boycott, but they go to an immoral excess when they unite to inflict inconvenience—often grave inconvenience—on those who refuse to be persuaded. This is the general rule; it is not denied that there may occur instances in which the obligation of disinterested persons to join in a laudable boycott would become so grave and direct as to render them justly liable to the penalty of being themselves boycotted when they fail to discharge this obligation. The sweat shops, for example, against which Cardinal Gibbons spoke, might possibly become so degrading that the buyers of clothing would do right to withhold their patronage not only from the guilty manufacturers, but even from merchants who persisted in handling the sweat shop goods. Cases of such gravity could, of course, occur but seldom. Moreover, when the utmost that the moral law will allow has been said in defense of the boycott, one all-important consideration remains, namely, that it is, like the strike, a dangerous and extreme method, should be employed only as a last resource and then only with the greatest caution.

3. THE "CLOSED SHOP."—This phrase refers to the unionist policy of refusing to work with non-unionists. The "shop," that is to say, any establishment in which the union has got a foothold, is to be "closed" to all except the union's members, not "open" to all comers. The union wishes to organize all the workers in a trade, so that it will be in a better position to bargain with the employer. If this motive is not justifiable, the unionists, it is evident, sin against charity by attempting such compulsion toward their fellow laborers. They offend against the rule which requires men to do unto each other as they would be done by—to treat one another as brothers. The unionist maintains that the ends that he seeks to attain are amply sufficient to justify the policy of the "closed shop." Workingmen who refuse to join the union and yet work side by side with its members share the advantages that the union makes possible. They desire to reap where they have not sown. They, furthermore, frequently render impossible collective bargains between the union on one side and the employer on the other, because they are not amenable to union discipline. It is not fair that the union should be held responsible for the fidelity of men over whom it can have no effective control. Finally, the "open shop" is impossible, since it tends inevitably to become either all union or all non-union. There is constant bickering and ill feeling between the two classes, and, worst of all, the non-unionist too

frequently allows the employer to use him as a lever to lower the conditions of the whole establishment or group. In a word, the demand that all shall join the union is made in the interests of self-protection. Now, any one of these three reasons is sufficient to absolve the union from the charge of uncharitableness in its policy of the "closed shop." To what extent they are realized in the industrial world need not now be discussed; but it seems quite probable that one or more of them finds quite general application. We may say in a general way that the cause of unionism, which is the cause of labor, renders more or less necessary the organization of all workers. Still less does the method in question seem to be contrary to justice. Neither employer nor non-unionist can show that any right of his is violated by the mere fact that the unionist refuses to work with the latter. Where the union is very strong, it is quite possible that this action will deprive the non-unionist of all opportunity of working, and consequently of earning a living. If, indeed, the refusal of the unionist were absolute—if he were to say to the non-unionist: "In no circumstances will I work with you," he would undoubtedly sin against justice. He would violate the non-unionist's right to live from the bounty of the earth, just as truly and as effectually as the owner of an island who should drive a shipwrecked voyager into the sea. As a matter of fact, the unionist does nothing of this kind; his refusal is conditional; he says in effect that if the non-unionist will not join the organization he shall not work, but this condition is frequently, perhaps in all but a small number of cases, reasonable. Therefore, even though the "closed shop" policy should deprive the non-unionist of all opportunity to work, the blame, so far as justice is concerned, should be placed on his own perverse will.

These are the general conclusions. They are evidently subject to some qualifications. For there are laborers whose unwillingness to join the union is due to weighty reasons of personal inconvenience, and not merely to a selfish desire to escape the burdens of unionism or to compete unfairly with the unionist. Again, it seems probable that many of the unions, as at present constituted and led, cannot be trusted to administer moderately and equitably the immense power that comes from complete unionization. This, however, is a question more of expediency than of rights. Undoubtedly the employer has the right to oppose the "closed shop" so long as his action does not tend to force unjust conditions upon the laborer. Within the same limits the non-unionist has the right to keep himself aloof from the organization. The rights of all three, the employer, the non-unionist and the unionist, in this matter are not absolute, like the right to live, but are conditioned, first, by the con-

sent of the other party whom it is desired to bring into the contract, and, second, by the effects that the intended action will have on the rights of others. These several rights have of late been the subject of much loose thinking and looser speaking. The legal and the moral rights of the non-unionist have been hopelessly confused. But, as John Mitchell pointed out in his clear and able address before the Civic Federation Conference in Chicago, the question is not legal but ethical; for there is no law on our statute books which forbids unionists to refuse to work with non-unionists, or to attempt by peaceable means to unionize any shop or trade. "The rights guaranteed to the non-unionist by the Constitution," which are so indignantly and patriotically proclaimed, have absolutely nothing to do with this question. Some of the attempts to set forth the moral rights involved are equally absurd. Very decidedly, the non-unionist has *not* the right to work when, where, how and for whom he pleases, and even if he had, it would not give him the right to compel the unionist to work beside him. A man has no more right to work when, where, how and for whom he pleases than he has to fire off his pistol when, where, how and at whom he pleases. No man has "a right to do what he pleases with his own"—neither with his life, nor his faculties, nor his property, nor his labor, nor anything that is his. The non-unionist has no right to work for John Jones if the latter does not wish to hire him, nor, in general, to work in any circumstances involving the consent of others without having first obtained such consent. If one were to take seriously some of the hysterical denunciations of the "closed shop," one might be tempted to infer that this policy was entirely new to the world and in defiance of all the lessons and precedents of history. The truth is that it was enforced for centuries by the trade and craft guilds throughout Western Europe. Speaking of the charters obtained by the English craft guilds from Henry II., Ashley says: "The only definite provision was that no one within the town (sometimes within the district) should follow the craft unless he belonged to the guild. The right to force all other craftsmen to join the organization—*Zunft-zwang*, as the German writers call it—carried with it the right to impose conditions, to exercise some sort of supervision over those who joined." ("English Economic History," Vol. I., p. 82.) Imagine a modern labor union, say the Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Workers, clothed with this legal privilege! The non-unionist would be prevented not merely by the refusal of the unionist to work with him, but by the law of the land, from securing employment on any street railway in the country unless he became a member of the union. Yet this was the arrangement that arose and flourished under the guidance

and encouragement of the Catholic Church. And it was right. In those days men believed in the reign of law, in the doctrine of live and let live, in security of occupation for the honest worker, in preventing the selfish and irresponsible worker from injuring his fellows; and they knew nothing of that insane individualism that ends logically in the crushing out of the weak and the aggrandizement of the strong.

4. THE LIMITATION OF OUTPUT.—The unions are not infrequently accused of fixing an arbitrary limit to the amount of work per day that their members shall do or allow to be done in a given establishment. While this practice is not formally recognized or defended, there is a great deal of evidence tending to show that it is more general than labor leaders seem willing to acknowledge. Be this as it may, the morality of limiting a man's output depends entirely on the point at which the limit is placed. Indiscriminate condemnation of this method is just as unreasonable as indiscriminate condemnation of the strike, the boycott or the "closed shop." The unionist is charged with preventing the more efficient workmen from producing a greater amount than those of medium ability and with refusing to allow machinery to be operated at its highest capacity. His reply is that the exceptional man is welcome to turn out all the work that he pleases, and to get all the wages that he can, provided that his output is not made the standard for the majority. He complains that in a given trade, say bricklaying, the man of exceptional skill and quickness is often set as a pacemaker. To equal what is for him an ordinary rate of speed, the efforts of all the others will have to be extraordinary. This is manifestly unfair. Workmen of average capacity—that is, the overwhelming majority—toiling day after day, should not be required to perform more than an average, normal day's work. They ought not to be expected to work continuously at the highest pitch of exertion of which they are capable; for this is to violate the laws and standards of nature. Man's fullest and most intense exertions were intended as a reserve for special emergencies, and the attempt to put them forth continuously means disease and premature decay. It is consequently inhuman and immoral. By all means let the exceptional man produce more and receive more than the others, but let him not be constituted the standard to which they are compelled to conform.

The unionist will sometimes admit that he hinders the most productive use of machinery, but his defense is that machines are frequently run at a speed that demands unreasonable activity and an unhealthful intensity of effort. This claim is true to a greater extent than most persons suspect. "Perhaps the most significant

feature of modern industry is the increasing intensity of exertion, owing to the introduction of machinery and the minute division of labor. . . . The result is that the trade life of the workingman has been reduced in many industries." ("Final Report of United States Industrial Commission," p. 733.) "I have seen in a New England factory," says John Graham Brooks, "a machine working with such rapidity as to excite wonder that any one could be induced to follow it nine hours a day. Upon inquiry the foreman told me how it had been managed. 'This invention,' he said, 'is hardly six months old; we saw that it would do so much more work that we had to be very careful in introducing it. We picked the man you see on it because he is one of our fastest. We found out what it could do before we put it into the room. Now they will all see what it will turn out when it is properly run.' 'Properly run' meant to him run at its very highest speed. This was the standard pressure to which all who worked it must submit." ("The Social Unrest," p. 191.) In the chapter from which this extract is taken there is a mass of evidence sufficient to warrant the conclusion that running machinery at such a high speed as to demand from the tender the fullest exertion and intensity of which he is capable is the settled policy of a very large section of the owners of machinery. As Dr. Cunningham puts it: "There is a temptation to treat the machine as the main element in production and to make it the measure of what man ought to do instead of regarding the man as the first consideration and the machine as the instrument which helps him." ("The Use and Abuse of Money," p. 111.) The result is that the machine tenders are worn out, useless, unable to retain their places at fifty and not unfrequently at forty-five. If the trade union or any other lawful social force can "restrict output" sufficiently to prevent this process of slow murder it will vindicate the moral law and confer a benefit upon society that will be felt not merely to-day, but for all future ages. The purpose of machinery is to improve life, not to destroy it, and the unionist is right in so far as he insists that it shall not be perverted from its proper function. In one word, restriction of output is right when it strives to protect the worker against being compelled to perform more than a normal day's work; when it goes beyond this point it is unjustifiable and dishonest.

5. THE LIMITATION OF APPRENTICES.—Employers of skilled labor often complain that the unions will not allow them to train as many apprentices as the trade requires. The unionist replies: "They ask us to put in more apprentices when there is no shortage of workmen; when we can furnish first-rate men who are now out of work. That would mean that we were to help train new men to compete with our own members out of work." ("The Social Un-

rest," p. 5.) The issue here drawn seems to be one of fact: do or do not the unions allow a sufficient number of apprentices to be trained to meet the demand? If we look a little deeper, however, we shall find that we are confronted by two incomplete and therefore inaccurate statements of the same fact. The employer's real burden of complaint in most cases is that he cannot get enough apprentices to supply the demand that would exist if wages were lower, and wages would be lower if he could increase the supply. This contingency the unionist recognizes, fears and tries to prevent by shutting out some of those who wish to enter the trade. He is probably quite willing to admit them in numbers sufficient to meet the demand at current wages, or at the higher wage to which he thinks he is entitled. The fundamental difference, then, between him and the employer in this matter seems to be one of wages. What, then, is to be said concerning the morality of the practice? Conformably to his theory that the skilled laborer has a right to the trade that he has learned, the Abbé Naudet maintains that the limitation of apprentices should be enforced by law. ("*Propriété, Capital, et Travail*," pp. 388, 389.) So far as the relations between himself and his employer are concerned, it would seem that the unionist is guilty of no injustice or uncharity in keeping down the number of apprentices, provided they are still sufficient to supply the needs of the trade at fair wages. In other words, the limitation should not go so far as to create a scarcity that would cause wages to become extortionate.

There is, however, another aspect of the question besides the relations between employer and employé. The more difficult is the entrance to the higher trades the greater are the disadvantages endured by the great mass having no special skill—"the common laborers." "One result of the organization of the skilled trades," says Mr. J. A. Hobson, "has been to render it more difficult for outsiders to equip themselves for effective competition in a skilled trade. To some extent, at any rate, the skilled unions have limited the labor market in their trade. The inevitable result of this has been to maintain a continual glut in the low-skilled labor market." ("*The Problem of the Unemployed*," p. 20.) This glut would be relieved to some extent if the entrance to the skilled trades were unrestricted. For those remaining in the ranks of the unskilled would not be obliged to compete quite so sharply with one another. And those who were allowed to move up would receive a considerable benefit. In the skilled occupations the tendency would, of course, be downward, but they are for the most part fairly well organized and pretty well able to take care of themselves. Even after the influx of members consequent on the removal of restric-

tions they would be in a much better position than the great body below them. It is the almost complete helplessness of the latter that makes the "labor question" so threatening and so difficult of solution. The skilled workers, as a rule, receive tolerable justice, and do not constitute a serious problem. In view of these facts there seems to be an obligation of charity forbidding the skilled workers to render the elevation of their less fortunate fellows as difficult as they sometimes do by the limitation of apprentices.

6. TYRANNY AND DISHONESTY.—These features of the labor movement cannot in the strict sense of the word be called methods, but they have attracted sufficient attention and criticism to deserve notice in any treatment of the morality of union practices and tendencies. A peculiarity of recent discussion of the labor union is the amount of denunciation visited upon the walking delegate. He is regarded by many as the chief cause of labor disturbances, while as a matter of fact he is merely the representative, the business agent, as he is called technically, of the union, appointed to execute its will, not clothed with the powers of an autocrat. Only in rare instances has he the power of his own motion to declare a strike or inaugurate any other movement of similar importance. Generally speaking, all his larger acts, tyrannical or otherwise, are the acts of the men whom he represents. He could not long retain his position were he to conduct himself with the lordly independence and indifference that is sometimes attributed to him. "For trade unions at large in the United States the walking delegate represents the opinion and will of his union more closely than most Congressmen represent the opinion and will of their constituents." ("The Social Unrest," p. 151.) And he is absolutely necessary if the union is to attain its object of enabling a group of individuals to act as a unit in dealing with their employer. To eliminate him would be to eliminate the union. This, however, does not mean that some of the petty tyrannies practiced both by him and the privates in the ranks could not consistently with the welfare of the union be abolished. In the manner in which strikes are sometimes called and conducted; in the reckless, inconsiderate, even cruel use of the boycott; in the oppressive enforcement of the "closed shop" policy, hardships are inflicted on the employer, the laborer and the general public which cannot be adequately described except as mean advantages taken of temporary helplessness. Especially is this true of the innocent third party, the customer or consumer, who is dependent both upon the union and the employer. Want of space forbids giving instances of such petty annoyances and injuries, but any one who has come into actual and interested contact with the disputes between labor and capital knows that they are not isolated

exceptions. It is a question not of any one definite method, but of a reprehensible habit of mind and will which finds numerous and various outlets for practical expression. The unionists make the mistake of enforcing a too rigid interpretation of their rights in circumstances where their opponents or their innocent dependents are peculiarly unable to help themselves. They—or some of them—should try to realize that even in war certain weapons and practices are tabooed by all civilized peoples; that the use of oppressive tactics by the employer does not justify them in retaliating in kind; that, in the words of the poet:

It is excellent
To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant.

The charge of dishonesty is directed almost entirely against the leaders. Those who make this accusation oftenest could not, in all probability, name half a dozen among all the union leaders in the United States. It is safe to say that many of them have in mind only one man, the notorious Sam Parks. The fact seems to be that the proportion of labor leaders who are dishonest is smaller than the proportion of dishonest politicians or dishonest public officials. Parks was, indeed, both unfaithful to his fellow unionists and extortionate in his dealings with employers. He misused the funds of the union, called strikes with a view to being paid for declaring them off, and in return for bribes allowed employers to hire non-unionists instead of unionists. Yet even he represented the will of the union, inasmuch as the majority of its members were not sufficiently vigilant and aggressive to depose him. "How was it possible for such a man to control absolutely his thousands of iron workers?" asked Ray Stannard Baker of a labor leader, and got this reply: "If you will explain how Croker bossed the Democratic party of New York—a party full of honest men—when every one knew he was grafting; how he collected money from the wealthy owners of the street railway companies and gas companies, and from other prominent business men, I will explain how Parks gets his hold on the building trades." (*McClure's Magazine*, November, 1903.) There is no reason in the nature of things why a labor leader should be proof against the temptation to misuse his power for private gain any more than there is reason to expect that a public official will always be scrupulously honest and faithful. Especially if, as Mr. Baker has shown to be true in the case of Parks, there are employers who prefer a dishonest labor leader. Mr. Baker maintains that some employers, particularly in the building trades, do not want honest walking delegates any more than they want honest building inspectors. They bribe the latter in order to escape com-

pliance with the civil law, and the former in order to circumvent their agreements with the union or to secure an unfair advantage over a rival employer. They have induced labor leaders to supplant with cheaper workers the men whom the leaders were sworn to serve, and to foment strikes against competitors. Mr. Baker makes the latter charge against the Fuller Construction Company, "the trust of the New York building trades," whose buildings somehow went up without interruption during the big lockout last summer. Walking delegates of the type of Parks and Murphy deserve all the denunciation that they have received, but it must be remembered that not all their offenses were acts of brutal extortion. They made other dishonest contracts with employers—contracts which required a willing bribe-giver as well as a bribe-taker. If the case of these men stood on a bad eminence of complete isolation, it could be dismissed as unworthy of much attention, but unfortunately it seems to be merely one in a system that will not easily or quickly disappear. It is not reasonable to expect that men who will bribe a public official should hesitate about bribing the agent of a labor union. And, as already noted, we ought not to expect a higher grade of honesty from the representatives of labor than from the representatives of the general public. In the words of District Attorney Jerome: "This corruption in the labor unions is merely a reflection of what we find in public life—and this corruption in public life is merely a reflection of the sordidness of private life."

7. EXCESSIVE DEMANDS.—A large number of the friends of labor are tempted to oppose the whole labor movement because of what seem to them unreasonable demands for higher wages and shorter hours. They complain that the unions very frequently show a disposition to take all that they can get, regardless of considerations of justice, and an utter indifference to the welfare of the consumer. Now, it is beyond reasonable doubt that unfair conditions have been demanded and obtained by some unionists. For just as there is a wage that is too low to be equitable, so is there one that is too high. Laborers have no more right to force wages indefinitely up than employers have a right to force them indefinitely down. Very few laborers seem to realize that a limit to the material advancement of the great majority of them has been fixed, not only by justice, but by the country's resources. In the present state of the arts of production and of the productiveness of nature, it is absolutely impossible that all Americans, or even a bare majority, should be provided with annual trips to Europe, automobiles or palatial dwellings; or even with long vacations, a horse and carriage and a piano. After the primary wants of all had been supplied—which is very far from being true at present—there would not be enough of these

secondary goods to go round. In the most equitable scheme of distribution practicable they would have to be reserved for a minority comprising two classes: those who could make the best use of such superfluities, and those whose social services are so important that they can demand and receive from society an exceptional remuneration. This is not to imply that all who at present enjoy these things fall into either of these classes. We are not now concerned with the inequalities of the existing distribution, but with the indestructible and undeniable fact that the physical impossibility of an indefinite improvement in the condition of the mass of laborers renders the claim to such advancement ethically invalid. Consequently they ought not to indulge in vain expectations nor talk glibly about rights that have no foundation in reality. In spite of these general truths the difficulty of determining the upper limit of fair wages for any concrete group of laborers is so great as to compel a prudent moralist to pause before attempting to estimate it in dollars and cents. All fair-minded men admit that the laborer has a right to a wage sufficient to maintain himself and family in the conditions of a comfortable, reasonable and moral life, and that this minimum varies for different classes, in accordance with the nature of their work and the standard of life to which they have been accustomed. But this is merely an irreducible moral minimum; it is not necessarily the full measure of complete justice. To deny this is to assume that of all the classes of the population, laborers only have not the right to use their power of entering into advantageous contracts—in their case, wage contracts—for the purpose of obtaining a higher standard of living. This position would scarcely be maintained by any moralist of authority. Consequently those persons who assert that the unions have demanded more than is just would probably find it difficult to prove this assertion in more than an insignificant minority of instances. And this minority is undoubtedly smaller in proportion than the number of employers who receive excessive interest or excessive profits.

There seems to be a large amount of truth in the charge that the unions are frequently indifferent to the welfare of the consumer. A particularly flagrant type is described by Ray Stannard Baker in *McClure's Magazine* for September, 1903. Certain employers' and employes' associations in Chicago have entered into an agreement which prevents the laborers concerned from working for any one who is not a member of the employers' association. On the other hand, the employers bind themselves not to hire any one not belonging to the association of laborers. The result is a monopoly more thorough than any combination of laborers alone or of employers alone. And they seem to have used their power to exact both

unfair wages and unfair profits, the excess being charged to the consumer. Similar combinations, though not so oppressive nor so strong, exist elsewhere. And yet any one who is acquainted with the industrial history of the last century is bound to acknowledge that the consumer is only receiving a modicum of poetic justice. During the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century the whole organization of industry was directed to the supreme end of producing cheap goods. The human beings who produced the goods were almost entirely ignored by that portion of the community that is somewhat vaguely described as "the general public." "Cotton is already two pence a yard or lower, and yet bare backs were never more numerous among us. Let men cease to spend their existence incessantly contriving how cotton can be made cheaper, and try to invent, a little, how cotton at its present cheapness could be somewhat justlier divided among us." Thus Carlyle, in that passage in "Past and Present" which contains his merciless castigation of the Gospel of Mammonism and Competition, as it was preached and practiced in the England of his day. Indeed, the gospel of cheap goods is still somewhat widely practiced, for example, in the sweat shops of our great cities and in the cotton mills of the Southern States. At any rate, the consumer stands in no immediate or grave danger. Long before his exploitation by the labor unions—either singly or in combination with employers—becomes general, the State will undoubtedly resume a function that it should never have abdicated, namely, that of limiting the power of either labor or capital to exact extortionate prices. In this respect they managed things better in the Middle Ages. To quote Ashley: "Then, again, it is the merit of the guild system that it did for a time, and in a large measure, succeed in reconciling the interests of consumers and producers. The tendency of modern competition is to sacrifice the producers; to assume that so long as articles are produced cheaply, it hardly matters what the remuneration of the workmen may be; but the guild legislation kept steadily before itself the ideal of combining good quality and a price that was fair to the consumer, with a fitting remuneration to the workman." ("English Economic History," Vol. II., pp. 168, 169.)

THE REASONABLE ATTITUDE TOWARD THE LABOR UNION.

The unfavorable criticisms of the labor union which have been so frequent of late come mostly from employers who hold a partisan theory of the wage contract, or from public speakers and writers who cling to a false theory of individual freedom. Representatives of the former class are very numerous in the Citizens' Industrial Association. Some of these seem to let pass no opportunity for

denouncing the infringement of their rights committed by the unions that insist on the "closed shop," the limitation of apprentices and similar practices; and they seem to believe in their assertions. A good example of this habit of mind is seen in a speech made by the toast master of the last banquet held by the Building Contractors' Association in Chicago: "It is ridiculous to think that you should be obliged to waste your time discussing your rights with walking delegates, business agents and labor leaders. You have your rights, and no man should be able to step in and dictate to you and tell you where your rights begin and end." Employers of this type are very fond of the word "dictate" in condemning the attempt of the unionist to lay down conditions without which he will not enter the wage contract; whereas, the simple truth—self-evident to all except the prejudiced—is that in a two-sided contract, such as that between employer and employé, every condition, concomitant and consequence that affects both parties should in all reason and justice be determined by both parties. The non-unionist who says to his employer: "Unless you give me a rise in wages I will not work for you any longer" is just as truly and as effectively "dictating" as the unionist who says: "I will not continue in your employ if you hire men that do not belong to the union." The same remark applies to about every other condition that the union regularly insists upon; and the employer has no more right or reason to assume that his employés should have no voice in the determination of these conditions than that they should have no voice in fixing the rate of wages. He would be incensed—and rightly—if they should refuse to hear any objection that he might have to the "closed shop," and should take the position that any attempt to induce them to concede this point, or even to discuss the question, constituted an attack on their "sacred right to work under whatever conditions they pleased." Yet this contention of the laborers would be no more tyrannical, unjust or unreasonable than the employer's assumption that any attempt to secure or to discuss the "closed shop" is an invasion of his right to "manage his business as he pleases."

One potent cause of this unreasonable position is the fact that many of the conditions of employment which the unionist now insists on helping to determine have until recently been under the exclusive control of the employers. Very naturally many of the latter do not take kindly to the relinquishment of powers which they had come to regard as rights. In the beginning they opposed the union as such because its officials "interfered" between them and their own employés; now they object to the unions "going beyond their proper sphere." Mr. John Graham Brooks says that employers spoke

very friendly words before the Industrial Commission concerning the right of labor to organize and the usefulness of the unions, "when they kept to their proper business, . . . but the labor organization which most employers approve is a docile, mutual benefit association. It is a trade union that makes no trouble for them. The actual trade union which exists to maintain what it believes to be its group rights, to make its bargains collectively and to struggle for every advantage it can get, few employers would tolerate an instant if they could avoid it." ("The Social Unrest," p. 37.) The explanation of this attitude is, of course, to be found partly in the desire for gain, but it is to a large extent due to the desire for power, "the passion for masterhood," which in days gone by kept the serf in subjection to the lord and the slave in subjection to the master, and which still shuts out the Negro from all but menial occupations. Consciously or unconsciously, too, many employers continue to regard the laborer as the lord looked upon the serf—a being of a lower order who was not qualified and should not presume to have a great deal to say in shaping the relations between himself and his master. The instinct of superiority which in one or other of its myriad forms is as old as the race and as long lived is hurt when the superior is placed on an equal footing of contractual power with those who have long been regarded as inferiors.

Disinterested public speakers and writers who find fault with the principle of unionism or with its legitimate methods are largely influenced by a false conception of the liberty and rights of the individual. This conception, this theory, was supreme in France and throughout the English-speaking world at the beginning of the modern industrial régime one hundred years ago, and is still sufficiently strong to work immense harm in every relation of social life. "The principle which was in the mind of every eager politician Adam Smith and the Physiocrats applied to industry and trade. . . . Adam Smith believed in the natural economic equality of men. That being so, it only needed legal equality of rights and all would be well. Liberty was to him the gospel of salvation; he could not imagine that it might become the means of destruction—that legal liberty where there was no real economic independence might turn to the disadvantage of the workmen." (Toynbee, "The Industrial Revolution," pp. 13, 17.) Precisely this happened. The doctrine of unlimited competition, of no interference with the industrial activity of the individual, either by the State or by private associations of men, which was adopted as the supreme principle of the economic order that was ushered in by the great mechanical inventions at the end of the eighteenth century, soon led to the awful wage-slavery that for almost fifty years disgraced England. Not

only women, but children from six years up were kept at work for sixteen hours out of the twenty-four, and the factories were operated by night as well as by day. "In stench, in heated rooms, amid the constant whirling of a thousand wheels, little fingers and little feet were kept in constant action, forced into unnatural activity by blows from the heavy hands and feet of the merciless overlooker and the infliction of bodily pain by instruments of punishment invented by the sharpened ingenuity of insatiable selfishness." (Alfred, "History of the Factory System," Vol. I., pp. 21, 22.) This was only the logical result of the doctrine of unlimited individual freedom, the freedom of the citizen to sell his labor, and that of his wife and children, in whatever conditions and on whatever terms he saw fit, without let or hindrance from "paternalistic" legislation or from the "interference" of labor organizations. Trade unions were under the ban of the law, for they restrained freedom of contract. When philanthropic men tried to secure the passage of factory laws limiting the working hours of women and children and fixing an age below which the latter could not be employed, they had to meet the same arguments for individual rights and liberty that are used to-day against the efforts of unionists to restrict the self-destructive and class-destructive activity of the selfish, the weak and the ignorant individual laborer. Not all the crimes that have been committed in the name of liberty are political.

What, after all, is liberty? Negatively, it is absence of restraint; positively, and more adequately, it is presence of opportunity. We speak here only of the liberty that is called physical. Now, physical restraints are not all imposed by the strong arm of the civil law or by the muscular force of one's fellows. There is, besides, the restraint exercised by hunger, and cold, and the various other forms of helplessness due to the forces known as *economic*. Political and legal liberty are not the whole of social liberty, for a man may be free from subjection to a political despot and be legally empowered to enter every contract that is within the limits of reason, and yet be hindered by economic conditions—restraints—from making a contract that will safeguard his welfare and his rights. Since the only rational end of liberty is the good of the individual, such a person is not completely free; he is without that opportunity which is the positive and vital side of all true freedom. The man, for example, who must work to-day or go to bed—if he can find a bed—hungry is not free in the same sense as the employer who, if he fail to come to terms with this particular laborer, can afford to wait until next week. There can be no genuine freedom of contract between men whose economic position is so unequal that the alternative is for one grave physical suffering, and for the other a monetary

loss or an unsecured gain. Whenever this condition is realized, the liberty of contract possessed by the isolated laborer becomes the liberty to injure himself and his fellows by helping to establish an iniquitous rate of wages. Such an extreme of liberty is, despite the eloquent sophistry of the defenders of individualism, not worth preserving. It is a curse both to the individual who makes use of it and to society. Neither the liberty nor the right to do unreasonable things is a desirable possession. And when the labor union, by means of the collective bargain, the "closed shop" or any other legitimate method, makes this suicidal and anti-social exercise of freedom impossible, it deserves the approval of every intelligent lover of liberty, since it makes possible the only real freedom, which is opportunity.

Catholics especially should not allow themselves to be misled into opposition to the labor union by this specious plea of freedom for the individual "to work when, where and under what conditions he likes." This unreasonable extreme of liberty is no part of either Catholic theory or practice. According to Catholic doctrine, liberty is merely a means to right and reasonable self-development, and the liberty that does not tend toward this goal is baneful and false. In the Middle Ages—especially toward the close of that period—when Catholic principles dominated the political and industrial institutions of the greater part of Europe, the two opposite evils of tyrannical absolutism and anarchical individualism were equally unknown. "The doctrine of the unconditioned duty of obedience was wholly foreign to the Middle Age," says Gierke in his "Political Theories of the Middle Age;" and Mr. W. S. Lilly justly observes: "The monarch was everywhere bound by pacts, solemnly recognized and sworn to, as a condition of his unction and coronation, and was hemmed in on all sides by free institutions, by the Universal Church, 'the Christian Republic' as it was called, by universities, corporations, brotherhoods, monastic orders; by franchises and privileges of all kinds, which in a greater or less degree existed all over Europe." ("A Century of Revolution," p. 8.) On the other hand, the fiction of the physical and mental and economic equality of all the members of the commonwealth and their complete individual independence was nowhere assumed or aimed at. The very obvious fact that all the citizens have not the same interests, but are divided into classes, chiefly on economic lines, was frankly recognized; hence the individual was primarily regarded, not as one of a multitude of equally powerful atoms, but as a member of a certain class. Accordingly the different classes received from the civil authority recognition and privileges—as in the case already cited of the craft guilds—which were more or less adapted to safeguard their

peculiar welfare. The result was a truer and fuller, because more positive, liberty for the individual.

Here in America legislation does not formally recognize the existence of classes or class interests. It ignores the fact that for the great majority of individuals their class interests are their primary interests; that where they have one interest in common with all the other citizens of the country they have ten that are vital only to their particular class. The Constitution seems to assume that laws can be framed which will be equally favorable to all individuals, while, as a matter of fact, the balance of effect of almost every legal enactment of an economic nature is to benefit one class at the expense of another. As a consequence of this solicitude for an abstract individual citizen that never existed and never will exist, so long as men are born with unequal powers and perform different social functions, just and beneficial legislation is constantly prevented, or when enacted is declared unconstitutional. For example, the law providing for a progressive income tax was annulled by the Supreme Court as class legislation, because it imposed a heavier burden on the larger incomes. Yet this was one of the law's vital purposes. The attempt to regard as equal men who are not equal hinders proportional justice; for, as Menger has finely said, "Nothing can be more unequal than to treat unequals equally." To remedy this condition there is no need to return to the industrial organization of the Middle Ages, to the guild system; for it could not be adapted to the regime of machinery and large businesses. This is not the only objection to a return of the old order, but it is sufficiently powerful to convince any well informed man that the plan—and we sometimes hear it proposed seriously—is utterly impracticable. What is wanted is recognition of the political and social principle that underlay the guild organization of industry, the principle that so long as different economic classes exist each must receive the measure of protection, encouragement and privilege that is required to secure its rights and welfare. To this end it is necessary that the members of each class be organized; that the organizations be not merely tolerated and controlled, but assisted by law as well as by public opinion; that the labor union and every other lawful association be afforded adequate means to defend itself against both the unjust aggression of other classes and the destructive competition of the helpless, the ignorant and the selfish individuals of its own.

Criticism—constant and vigilant criticism—of the excesses of the labor union is, of course, demanded in the interests of justice and social order; but if it is to be effective it must not only be free from the prejudice begotten of self-interest or erroneous theories, as just

described, but it must be, moreover, based on adequate knowledge. This implies that some attention be given to the presentation of the case of the union by its own members. What is true of every social class must be fully and frankly recognized as true of workingmen, namely, that certain features and needs of the group can be understood by no one, no matter how good his intentions, so well as by the men who compose it. The failure of the older school of English economists to take into account this very obvious fact brought upon their science the hatred and contempt of the laborer. From their high and serene *a priori* ground the economists had proved to the benighted English workingmen that the whole principle of unionism, and especially the contention that wages could be raised by combination or by any other form of "artificial effort" that ran counter of the "wage fund theory," was ruinous and false. But the workingmen would not listen, and they had the satisfaction of seeing their position justified both by the logic of events and by the revised verdict of the economists. "Thus economic authority to-day, looking back on the confident assertions against Trade Unionism made by McCulloch and Mill, Nassau Senior and Harriet Martineau, Fawcett and Cairnes, has humbly to admit, in the words of the present occupant of the chair once filled by Nassau Senior himself (Professor Edgeworth, of Oxford) that 'in the matter of Unionism, as well as in that of the predeterminate wage fund, the untutored mind of the workman had gone more straight to the point than economic intelligence misled by a bad method.'" ("Industrial Democracy," p. 653.) Herein is contained a lesson for those well-meaning writers and speakers of to-day who feel competent to pronounce a final appreciation and criticism of unionism without having read the principles of a single trade union or made a serious attempt to understand the unionist's point of view. If criticism is to be intelligent and effective, it must proceed from a study of facts and conditions at first hand—or as nearly so as possible—and from a due consideration of the aims, and knowledge, and beliefs of *all* the classes concerned.

The conclusion that seems justified by this lengthy and yet summary study of the labor union is that the aims of the union are substantially right, and that of its methods, only violence, tyranny and the tendency to make excessive demands are in all circumstances unjustifiable. When confined within reasonable limits all the other methods are lawful, both legally and morally. It is freely admitted that the unions have sometimes—perhaps correct language would authorize the term "frequently"—been too hasty in making use of their extreme, though legitimate, methods, and too willing to push them to their furthest limits. And it is always assumed that no

one of the methods is justifiable unless the concrete demand on behalf of which it is employed is reasonable. It must, however, be noted here that the verification of this condition is not always as easy as the unionists seem to imagine. Certainly the determination of the equities of any dispute between employer and employ  s can no more be entrusted exclusively to the latter than to the former. The maxim that no one is a competent judge of his own cause does not admit the laborer as its unique exception. The tributes sometimes paid to the working class by union speakers and writers imply that the members of this class are the people, and that wisdom and fairness will die with them. As a matter of fact, some of the worst of the "labor-crushers," whether among overseers or employers, are men who were formerly wage-earners; and some of the most exclusive and selfish social groups in existence are the unions that control certain trades—"the aristocracy of unionism." An abundance of facts of this kind—to say nothing of the unchangeable limitations of human nature—forbids the calm observer to take seriously the promises of socialism concerning the reign of justice and equality that will arrive when the Proletariat gets control of the political and industrial power of the nation. Laborers are no more immune from error or the liability to abuse power than any other class of human beings. Happily, one is not constrained by any rule of logic or common sense to make an act of faith in the moral perfection of the laborer as a preliminary to belief in the principle of unionism. For the man who is interested in the welfare of the toiler, and who wishes to see our present social order preserved, it is sufficient to realize that the aims and methods of the union are substantially just; that, as long as religion has such small influence on industrial relations, the union is the only social force that can afford adequate protection to the great mass of laborers; and, finally, that the existing unions constitute the only power that can prevent a wholesale going over of the workers to socialism.

JOHN A. RYAN.

St. Paul, Minn.

TRACES OF REVELATION IN HOMER.

ANY one who sets himself to dig after the roots of Homeric religion, will, nine cases out of ten, feel like casting his tools to the four winds of heaven just as soon as he reaches the gods of Homer. What an odd set they are, anyhow—"That motley crew of the gods of old," as Goethe calls them¹—a puzzle, take them how or where you will. What has brought about this jumble that we try to unify and to classify as Homeric religion? Are there in it any traces at all of primitive revelation?

In the first place, there are a few that insist it is all primitive revelation—all theology learned by Homer from contemporary Hebrews or from the law of Moses and set forth under the disguise of pagan myth and symbolism. A list of these zealots, who went to such lengths as to claim Homer was inspired, is given by Abbot Cesarotti in his colossal and scholarly edition of the *Iliad*.² Gladstone, in his "*Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age*," relies upon this list, and, indeed, draws well nigh as freely from the work of Cesarotti as he does from that of Nägelsbach.³

The patriarch of this school of Hebraistic sympathizers was Pelagius, a Roman patrician of the fifth century. He wrote the gospel story in verses extracted from Homer, but was killed by the Emperor Zeno before he had finished his poem. It is commonly put down as a fact by Gladstone and others—though violently pulled up as a fiction by Cesarotti and most critics—that Eudocia, the learned and pious wife of Theodosius, completed this work, and that her output is the very book which nowadays floats around under the caption "*Centones Homerici*"—Patchwork, or, better still, Crazy-work from Homer.

Later on we find Mme. Dacier working along the same line of argument, save that she gives her fancy still more of an airing among the clouds of conjecture. She claims that Plato, for instance, borrowed the dogma of the Trinity from Timaeus, the Locrian, who had got it of the Italian school. In the *Epinomis*, she argues, he lays down as a principle the first good, the word and the soul; the first good is the Father, the word is the Son of the first good, the soul is the Spirit.⁴ In like manner, to her the very little-nesses of Homer's gods are great; she hangs on for dear life to

¹ "Der alten Götter bunt Gewimmel" (*Die Braut von Corinth*).

² "*Ragionamento Storico-Critico*," *L'Iliade di Omero*, Padua, 1786.

³ "*Homerische Theologie und Nachhomerische Theologie*."

⁴ *Œuvres de Platon*, Vol. I., p. 194; quoted by Chateaubriand, "*Genius of Christianity*," trans. by White, Baltimore, 1856, p. 55.

every passage of his, and defends it with energy alike and pathos from the doleful and baneful taint of paganism.

Gerard Croesius is led far away on this false scent, and strives to demonstrate etymologically, archæologically and otherwise that the peaceful faces of the venerable Hebrew patriarchs hide behind the masks of Homer's gods and demi-gods; that Illios is Jericho; Helen, Rahab; Nestor, Abraham; Agamemnon and the Achæians are Joshua and the Israelites; Penelope is Sarah, her insolent maidens are Hagar, her geese (*αἰγες*) are, as a matter of course, the Chanaanites. But what will this paragon of philology do with Odysseus? Make him Abraham? Not unless old Nestor be given a new mask. Yet Odysseus should be Abraham, for Penelope is Sarah. What is to be done? Croesius gets out of the difficulty nicely. Odysseus is, throughout the entire Odyssey, a man of many a shift, and can, therefore, readily make shift to symbolize Moses, Abraham and Lot, each in his turn.

Joshua Barnes went a step further in this realm of absurdity and nonsense, and drove himself, if no one else, into the stupid conviction that Homer was Solomon. Mark how he made good his point. Homeros, read after the Hebrew fashion, from right to left, is Soremo; and Soremo, by metalepsis, becomes Solemo; then, too, as e and o are interchangeable root vowels, we have Solomo. Anybody can now step over to Solomon. Mr. Barnes must have been a very shy man to have got comfort in such a fog.

Archdeacon Williams, in his "Homerus," published not very many years ago, resuscitates the Hebrew Homer, and ranges so far in his hierodidactic mysticism as to say that in Homer "we can trace most of the essential principles by which the Christian religion is distinguished."

But enough of this twaddle. Now that we bask in the exhilarating sunshine of a higher criticism, it teases us not a little to find that such addling moonshine ever passed muster as Homeric criticism at all. The poor old bard would wriggle and squirm in his grave if he knew people had Hebraized him so. Such crotchets and twisted views are curiosities of literature that have been toothsome morsels to the elder Disraeli and men of his sort, but can no longer interest us except as historic landmarks in Homeric criticism.

We shall try to show that there is in Homeric religion a trace, but only trace—and a scarcely discernible trace, at that—of primitive revelation. This traditive element we can hardly get at at all. It is well nigh overwhelmed by the element of invention. For though the gods of Homer are, take them all in all, meant to be above the human, none the less they are very human withal⁵—

⁵ II. 5, 860; 14, 140; 18, 217; 21, 407.

indeed, now and then, even far and away below the human. Only the note of immortality sets them distinctively above man; and, by a strange paradox, this very note is distinctive not of the godly essence, but of him that eats ambrosia, and is therefore shared in by the matchless ambrosia-fed steeds of ill-fated Achilles. As for the rest, whether in the physical or in the moral order, the ways of the gods are pretty much the ways of men; the traits of the former differ from those of the latter in degree rather than in kind.

First, what do we find in the physical order of things among the Olympians? Fights with men, quarrels among themselves, scarce a god that is not thwarted or made ridiculous, all manner of limitations of powers.

We say the gods fight with men. Whatsoever battles are waged round Priam's well-walled town are battles of the gods every bit as much as of Hector and Achilles. Plans are made in heaven and carried out on earth. Mutual hate and hostility and all the hellish passions that war sets ablaze within the breasts of men, are stirred up in the bosoms of the deathless gods. Upon the strong and mighty shield of Achilles, Hephaistos fashions an army of mortals led by Ares and Athene.⁶ Even golden Aphrodite betakes her to the fray. On her horse-taming Diomedes makes fierce onslaught, knowing she is a coward goddess, fitter far for loves than man-ennobling battle. A tiny bit of slender skin he lifts from off her shapely hand, wherefrom the ichor flows.⁷ Straightway the laughter-loving goddess goes to tell her pain to Ares, takes his steeds and hies her swift to Olympos, falls upon the lap of her mother Dione and wails the fate that has brought her so much pain and shame. Meanwhile her lover seeks revenge; but noble-hearted Tydeus' son is more than a match for him; set on and guided by Athene, Diomedes drives his spear full tilt against huge Ares. Loud bellows, then, the mighty god of war—loud as ten thousand fell warriors in grim array—and fares him to wide heaven there to cry.⁸

The gods not only fight with men, but quarrel among themselves as well. Athene escapes the lance of Ares, picks up a stone, hurls it at his neck and lays the graceful god sprawling graceless on the ground. Seven rods he covers.⁹ Athene laughs outright at him. With wonted folly the giddy Aphrodite rushes headlong in; she never knows that she is worthless in battle. A stunning blow from Athene's fist brings her to—or rather takes her from—her senses, and Aphrodite lies stretched in pain by Ares' side. Hera wrenches

⁶ Il. 18, 516.

⁷ Il. 5, 336.

⁸ Il. 5, 855.

⁹ Il. 21, 407.

the quiver from and lays it heavily on fair-tressed Artemis. We fairly hear the whack on whack and see the chaste huntress writhe and twist. In vain! She cannot get off from the whipping.

Moreover, there is scarce a god but is somehow or other thwarted or made ridiculous either by gods or by men. Ceres beholds her lover slain by Zeus. Hermes is worsted and put into a dreadful fright by Leto. Poseidon is baffled by Laomedon,¹⁰ nor is he able to take vengeance at the wrong done his big boy Polyphemos.¹¹ Hera is strung up by Zeus in midair, and dangles an anvil from each foot.¹² Her son, Hephaistos, is tossed by Zeus from high Olympos. All day he flies, and falls at night on Lemnos, and little life is in him. Thereafter he hobbles through the banquet halls and sets the blessed gods all laughing by his gait.¹³ Nor is Hephaistos the only butt of this hearty laugh. He turns it against his foe by fetching the gods to make a laughing-stock of Ares and Aphrodite ensnared in their shame.¹⁴

Lastly, the various powers of the gods—their sight, hearing, etc.—mighty though they may seem at times to be, are inevitably very much circumscribed. It could not be otherwise, since the gods are not self-existent, but are all born of Okeanos and Tethys. The sight of Helios cannot pierce the golden cloud that covers Zeus and Hera.¹⁵ Hephaistos sees not the adulterous carryings on of Ares and Aphrodite, till Helios plays the part of tale-bearer.¹⁶ The sottish pair see not the meshes in which the angered husband traps them. Such is their sight; their hearing is no better. The gods hear only when spoken to. From Olympos, Iris hears the petition of Achilleus;¹⁷ Thetis also hears him¹⁸, and Poseidon Aias.¹⁹ If not addressed, they rarely hear what is said. In motion they generally use steeds, or trip it lightly on land and water,²⁰ or wing it somehow through the air. They are not omnipresent by any means. Thetis cannot bring the prayer of Achilleus to Zeus for twelve days, because Zeus has gone to the Æthiopians for a dinner.²¹

So much for the physical limitations of the gods; their moral

¹⁰ Il. 21, 451.

¹¹ Od. 9, 525.

¹² Il. 15, 18.

¹³ Il. 1, 597.

¹⁴ Od. 8, 326.

¹⁵ Il. 14, 344.

¹⁶ Od. 8, 271.

¹⁷ Il. 23, 199.

¹⁸ Il. 18, 35.

¹⁹ Od. 4, 505. See also for like examples, Il. 8, 198; 15, 222 and 463; 16, 232 and 514; 23, 384; Od. 5, 283; 6, 20; 14, 310; 16, 263; 21, 413; 24, 164.

²⁰ Il. 14, 285.

²¹ Il. 1, 423.

limitations are, if possible, even less godlike; they are deceitful, unchaste and lacking in most virtues. The swineherd Eumalos surpasses most of them in moral goodness.

Their worst blemish is deceit. The worldly-wise among men demand an oath to confirm promises of the gods. Sharp-witted Odysseus takes such an oath from Kalypso and from Kirke. Small wonder. Even the higher deities are forever tricking and deceiving. On the plea of conciliating Okeanos with Tethys, Hera obtains from Aphrodite the girdle of love that steals the wits even of the wise,²² and straightway sets herself, by this same girdle, to steal the wits of Zeus and defeat the Trojan cause so very dear to Aphrodite's heart. Sleep gives aid, but first requires the queen of gods to swear by earth and sea she will repay him. Together both they beguile and overpower the father of the gods, while Poseidon leads the Danaans on.²³ In many and many a way Hera entraps Zeus to the gain of her dear Achaians. On the very day on which Heracles is to be born, she gets great promises from her spouse in favor of the descendants of him that shall that day be born of woman by Zeus;²⁴ hurries the birth of Eurystheus in Argos, delays that of Heracles in Thebes and sets at naught all the cherished plans of the thundering lord of Olympos. No wonder he snatches her by the hair and hurls her from the mountain of the gods! Hera's deceit is matched by that of many of the gods. Even Athene tells a fib, and under form of Deiphobes, beloved of Hector, so works upon the fleet Trojan as to make him stand, fight Achilles and meet his doom.²⁵ In this wise the gods mislead poor men by craft and plunge them deep down into dire misfortunes, and even sport with the right that men should have to truth. This is just as we should expect it to be, since all the gods, even Zeus, are mere playthings, subject to the caprice and whims of Ate, goddess of delusions,²⁶ and of Moira, blasting fate.²⁷

In unchastity, the gods are degraded far below the level of men. We are delighted with the seemly modesty that graces Nausikaa and calls forth from Odysseus a respect he showed not to Kalypso nor to Kirke. The chastity of Penelope shines out as that of Homer's ideal wife; the basest lust is depicted in the scenes of Ares and Aphrodite at the house of Hephaistos, and of Zeus and Hera on Mount Ida.

In other virtues, too, are the gods very deficient. Nägelsbach

²² Il. 14, 205.

²³ Il. 14, 352-356.

²⁴ Il. 19, 95.

²⁵ Il. 22, 239.

²⁶ Il. 19, 95.

²⁷ Il. 16, 434.

deems that holiness and moral excellence form no essential element in the Homeric conception of them.²⁸ They are easily angered, jealous of slights and petty neglect, envious and relentless in nagging the unlucky mortals that have rubbed up against them. Of course they are good and just at times, but only at times. Their strength rather than goodness inspires men and calls forth fear rather than love. Homer seems to know nothing much, if anything at all, of love of God to man, love of man to God and submission to the divine will.

Such is the Olympian set—not one whit better than the smartest smart set that soars above the lowlier ones of to-day. Can we wonder the gods were scorned and berated by one of Homer's noblest characters, the wronged and valiant Menelaos?²⁹ May we not join Eusebius,³⁰ and lay no blame on Plato³¹ for insisting that, in the ideal state, people should not read, either with or without allegorical explanations, about the battles of the gods of Homer, nor about Hera "hanging dangling down, oh," nor about Hephaistos' airy flight?³² What have we to say of this jumble? Is there in it a trace of revealed truth? Not one bit of it! This is all the inventive element—the make-believe, trumped-up part—the funny side, as it were, of Homeric religion—the farce of the gods. There is a traditive element, a very sober side, too, in Homer's religion—a tragedy of deity. But of this later on.

This inventive element is so overwhelming that most writers on our subject lay aside at the outset all possibility of a traditive element in Homeric theogony, and scout the very idea that the faintest shadow of a trace of primitive revelation may be pointed out therein. Among these authors most say Homer's religion is all mythology; Herodotus, Isocrates, Plato and a few others seem to make it all Homerology.

Herodotus³³ thought Homer set the ball a-rolling and Hesiod pushed it on.³⁴ They gave the gods titles, prerogatives, personal and moral traits, and duties. They coined their own gods. As for Hesiod, he may have put a few notions of his own into the Homeric rhapsodies, but his gods are in the main those of Homer, and he seems to depart from the latter's theme only in the acknowledgment of spirit (*daimones*) that are not gods. These three myriads of dwellers in the air, mediators between gods and men,

²⁸ "Homerische Theologie," p. 103.

²⁹ II. 3, 365; 13, 631.

³⁰ "Preparation for the Gospel," 13, 3 (Migne, "Greek Fathers," 21, 1066 b).

³¹ Rep. 2, 378.

³² Cf. Döllinger, "Jew and Gentile," trans. by Darnell, London, 1862, p. 282.

³³ 2, 53.

³⁴ Döllinger, p. 75.

protectors and guardians of us all,³⁵ are wonderfully like the choirs of angels of primitive revelation. But our question is not of Hesiod. Among the Attics, Isokrates insists that the gods never deliberate and act as Homer makes them to do; but the poet wishes to teach us that if they cannot read the future, much less can man.³⁶ We have already mentioned how wrongly Plato blames Homer for travestyng Hellenic theogony. Even Gladstone claims³⁷ that Homer was a maker not only of a language, but of a religion.

We think he was a maker of neither, but took things pretty much as he found them. We admit that, with all the inventive genius of a poet, he drew largely upon fancy for the coloring he gave things, and maybe even invented a few gods of his own; but we admit nothing more.

Homer's fancy must have idealized things not a little bit. His poems give evidence of a time when fancy and affection enlarged upon everything, when there was little of questioning, no stopping at absurdities, all was forward—all belief. In such a time, it seems as likely as not that the author of the *Iliad* drew from fancy as well as from fact, in portraying his gods with their political party splits, their hierarchy, contentions, revolts, stormy meetings, their gobbling up of food and swilling down of wine.

The assertion that Homer may have invented a few gods of his own we base on his love of the concrete. He is ever getting away from the abstract; it is his bugbear; he cannot abide it. He personifies anything and everything only to be concrete. We are amazed by his boldness and dash. Is a thing lofty and far away? He brings it down to the every-day level of the concrete matter-of-fact. He never serves out vague generalities. Hence, in his intensely rapid onrush of thought upon thought, he is ever as clear as the fountain Arethusa of Ithaka; though often in a hurry, he never raises such a dust as to hinder us from seeing his meaning through and through. His concreteness and personification keep him close to the thought he wishes to produce in us. He that made his arrow bitter, his darts hungry for human blood, the ground to laugh in the blaze of gleaming armor, the deathless horses of Achilleus to weep for Patroclus;³⁸ he that wrote of the black cloud of grief,³⁹ of purple death,⁴⁰ of black pains, the unharvested deep, the wine-dark sea, the pitiless day; he may readily be supposed to have added to the stock of concrete representations of religious notions, and to

³⁵ "Works and Days," 109-150; also 250.

³⁶ *Adv. Soph.*, sec. 2.

³⁷ "Studies on Homer."

³⁸ *Il.* 18, 426.

³⁹ *Il.* 17, 591; 18, 24.

⁴⁰ *Il.* 5, 83.

have given new food to the fancies of those that roamed fancy-free in his land of unshackled doubt and misbelief.

But the religion of Homer is that of an age, not of an individual. The singer of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* belonged to a people of an intellectual culture that was very high—higher, by a good deal, than the intellectual culture of college men that drop Greek and elect jigs in its stead.⁴¹ It was that singer's duty to reflect the thoughts, traditions and customs of the age whereof his mind was a mirror. No matter how great his use of fancy, that singer's plastic touch had no power to soften whatsoever things had been handed down with rigid features, no power to mould whatsoever things had been fixed and known. Whatever of the popular creed was at all stable, his airy music could never shake. The religious ideas he weaved into his poems were the ideas of the people, not merely his own—they were Hellenic theogony, not Homerology.

If not Homerology, is the religion of Homer to be looked on as all mythology? So think some of the ancients and the vast bulk of modern critics that have expressed an opinion on this matter.

The ancients were fully aware of what we have styled the farce of the gods of Homer, and were ever at a loss how to put more tone into that farce. From the sixth century B. C., desperate efforts were made to drive allegorical explanations through the Homeric poems, and thereby to bring order out of the chaos of Homeric theogony; but the drivers met with as little success as have the Hebraizers of Homer. Theagenes of Rhegium (520 B. C.) was, according to Döllinger,⁴² the first to patch an allegory on the top of the Homeric and Hesiodic poems. Heraclitus waxed wroth that any took offense at the story of Hera hanging in mid-air; all this meant only the formation of the elements and the universe.⁴³ Metrodorus made not only gods but heroes, too, to stand for natural phenomena, and put himself to his wits' end to get quit of the mist he raised.

These ancients old Eusebius lashed and rightly maintained, in his work on the "Preparation of the Gospel," that long before Homer's time the traditive element of primitive revelation had been on the wane among the Achaians and their neighbors, and that the gods of the Hellenes were no well wrought system of allegorical myths, but mere corruptions of revealed truth "handed down from times of utter darkness and a bestial life."

Of late the mythological theory of Homeric religion has met with strong defenders. Among these Dr. Döllinger stands out

⁴¹ The newspapers tell us that the students of one of our largest American colleges may this year elect a course in Irish jigs and count it for the B. A.

⁴² "Jew and Gentile," p. 281.

foremost. In his "Jew and Gentile" he admits the Bible as revealed truth, and hence cannot deny an original consciousness of divinity; but insists that this consciousness was early and entirely clouded by guilt among heathen people, and that the deification of nature and her powers lies at the root of all heathen religion.⁴⁴ In the same batch with him are "many and learned men, chiefly of the tribes of the Alemanni," to quote Lang's charming letter to Eusebius,⁴⁵ "who have almost conquered the whole inhabited world . . . they maintain that the gods of the nations were, in the beginning, such pure natural creatures as the blue sky, the sun, the air, the bright dawn and the fire." They allow to the gods no moral feeling whatsoever. The wrath of Poseidon at getting nothing for his pains in building Troia's walls is the very same raging of the billows that goes on to-day near Schliemann's excavations, with as little regard to moral feeling as it showed in the days of Laomedon. Forces of nature could not be fully understood, much less expressed, if taken apart from human nature, and so it came to pass that they were personified and deified.

Now all this may be, from a poetic standpoint, grand, ideal, sublime, intellectual and a great deal more. But in the face of facts it is much of it in the air; it will not stand criticism. We admit that there is in Homeric religion a vast deal of just such mythology as critics find in it. We deny that his religion is, from start to finish, only mythology—only the deification of nature powers—nothing more. Such an opinion has never been welded into any sort of system on which critics will agree, nor has it ever been backed up by arguments of even seeming force.

The lack of any scientific system resulting from this opinion is evidenced by the fact that, as Lang says, its expositors "are nowise at one with each other in their explanations." They are like the old-timers that filled the worn-out chairs of a moribund philosophy before good Eusebius' day. "For of old some boasted that Hera was the air, and some that she signified the love of woman and man, and some that she was the waters above the earth, and others that she was the waters under the earth, and yet others that she was the night, for that night is the shadow of the earth; as if, forsooth, the men who first worshiped Hera had understanding of these things."⁴⁶

The reason why no one system of Homeric theogony has ever been accepted by critics is the mass of contradictions inevitably wrapped up therein. Let us see a few of these contradictions.

⁴³ Schol. in Il. 15, 18.

⁴⁴ Page 65.

⁴⁵ "Letters to Dead Authors," N. Y., 1882, p. 163.

⁴⁶ Lang, p. 165.

A system of religion built up entirely on the deification of nature forces should present all the greater nature forces personified and deified in prominent, unmistakable, clear-cut relief. Homeric religion presents nothing of the kind. Air, earth, sun, moon, sea, wind are of the first importance in nature, and yet are either not deified at all or are set in an obscure background in Olympos. The more active a god is, the greater do his powers vary; the more frequently he appears at work in the poems, the more doubtful, far-fetched and insignificant his relations with nature forces seem to be; the closer he brings his character and personality into touch with us the less the likelihood that we may tag any single nature power to him and keep it there.

Take a few examples. Take Apollo, for instance. What in the wide world is Apollo the deification of? Light? Why, then, have we Helios? Plato makes Apollo god of poetry, prophecy, healing and archery.⁴⁷ If of healing, why have we Paieon? If of poetry, why the Muses? If of archery and destruction,⁴⁸ why Athene, goddess of war? Why Ares? Why the huntress Artemis? Apollo also is said to be the deification of prudence and craft.⁴⁹ If the former, why Mercury? If the latter, why Hephaistos?

It is claimed by some that Zeus is the deification of air. Why, then, is he said to dwell in the ether?⁵⁰ The scientist of to-day would look for the ether in him, not vice versa. If Zeus be the air, why does not he deliver Æneas from the hands of Achilles without putting strength into the warrior's knees?⁵¹ What becomes of Hera?

Who is Homer's deification of the sea? Poseidon, they say. Why not Okeanos? He seems the greater. From Father Ocean all the rivers flow and every sea, and all springs and deep wells. He fears, indeed, the lightning and dread thunder of great Zeus;⁵² but is not bound to hearken to the call of Themis, at the command of Zeus, nor haste him to the father's house on many-folded Olympos' beetling brow.⁵³ Why not Nereus to personify the sea? He is father of all the nymphs of the deep, and is styled the old man of the sea; he never leaves his home, whereas Poseidon is met with rarely on the sea, often at the head of his serried ranks upon the far-famed battlefield of Troia.

And so the list of incongruities goes on. In the face of such

⁴⁷ Cratylus 405 A.

⁴⁸ Od. 8, 323 and 329; 17, 494; 15, 410.

⁴⁹ Il. 22, 247.

⁵⁰ Od. 15, 523.

⁵¹ Il. 20, 92.

⁵² Il. 21, 198.

⁵³ Il. 20, 7.

facts we cannot admit that any acceptable system has ever reduced Homeric religion to the mere deification of nature powers and nothing more.

These many contradictions are a necessary sequel to the unscientific method of forcing facts into shape with a foregone theory, in place of shaping and paring and moulding the theory to suit the facts. No wonder, then, that the arguments, with which these critics back up their theories, are not even of seeming worth. When they want to get at the nature of a god, they first examine his name, tear it to very shreds, torment the letters thereof, bunch and rebunch them at will. If Greek will not serve their turn, away they fly to the Hebrew, Arabic or to some other non-Arian tongue. And this they call throwing light on the subject.

Why, this method is old as the hills, and was worn threadbare two thousand and odd years ago. All this sort of thing was laughed to scorn even in the crude, unscientific days of Sokrates. In the *Cratylus*, Plato makes his master to spin out some very odd derivations. Hera, for instance, is the deification of air, because the man who made names repeated the word ἀήρ very fast, and found he was saying ἡρα. Apollo is the physician, because the washer (ἀπολούων); the prophet, because he tells simple truth (ἀπλοῦς); the archer, because he is always shooting (ἀεὶ βάλλον). This is all very ingenious. So, too, is the way in which the maker of names gave us Athene. He deified the mind of God, and got θεοσνόη, took a for η, in the true foreign style, dropped o and σ, and had δένα; by repeating that fast he hit upon Athene. "Indeed," says Sokrates, "I bethink me of a very new and ingenious idea that occurs to me. . . . My notion is that we put in and pull out letters at pleasure, and alter the accents."⁵⁴ Stalbaum says the reader must be stupid as a stump if he do not see that Plato is here taking his fling and having a bit of fun.⁵⁵

Yet this pseudo-Sokratic method of analysis is the very method applied by Müller and many of the German critics in the study of Homeric religion. The result has been nothing much of truth, unwarranted conclusions, backed up by only the shadow of argument, and such a medley of opinions with regard to who's who in Olympos, as to force fully home to us the waggish conclusion Andrew Lang comes at: "Quot Alemanni, tot sententiae."

Thus far we have demonstrated the absurdity of basing Homeric religion on the fully developed system of the Hebrews, the impossibility of its being an outgrowth of Homer's fancy, the utter improbability of its upbuilding merely by a human instinct systematically

⁵⁴ Lang, "Letters to Dead Authors," p. 168.

⁵⁵ Cf. Plato's "*Cratylus*," trans. by Burges, London, 1850, p. 326, note 81.

to personify and to deify the great nature powers. The religion of Homer is not all theology nor all Homerology nor all mythology; it is a combination, as Jebb says,⁵⁶ "of various elements belonging to different stages of thought;" it is part theology and part mythology—in a word, theom mythology. Its real starting point seems most naturally to have been the ancient theistic traditions that held sway among the patriarchs of old. This traditive element was gradually corrupted, slowly disintegrated by the inventive elements already described; the truths of primitive revelation lagged behind and fell away into the background, while the falsehoods of invention sped on apace and took full fling in the foreground of the anomalous, disconnected and disjointed mass which, for want of any fitter name, we style the religion of Homer.

On what plea do we cling to this traditive element? Because there seem to be likely enough traces of primitive revelation in the Homeric poems—in the tragedy of deity, in minor details and in the very mythology of these poems.

First and foremost let us note well the solemn tragedy of deity that is enacted in the very midst of the farce comedy of the gods. Besides their gods, the Hellenes had their deity whose influence their ancestors must have early and long felt, early and long seen, early and long loved; else there would be no trace of this deity in Homeric times.

Yet traces of this deity crop out in scores of lines. The mythological gods are spoken of by name or grouped together under the concrete *οἱ θεοί*,⁵⁷ whereas *θεός* and *θεοί*⁵⁸ always designate a nobler, more abstract being than the commonplace dwellers on Olympus—a being far and away beyond invention, and very like to the God of primitive revelation. Unto *god* and *gods* are assigned attributes truly divine, utterly out of keeping with the ridiculous limitations already observed in the many-faced individuals that go to make up *the gods* and to fill up the noisy agora of Olympus.

Again and again we are told gods can do all things.⁵⁹ They can even make the wise to be fools and the scatter-brained to be level-headed.⁶⁰ Who could expect more of them? Again, gods are most blessed, and set apart from cares.⁶¹ A youth guided by them will never go wrong.⁶² For they are the authors of all good things.

⁵⁶ Homer, p. 83.

⁵⁷ Il. 4, 15.

⁵⁸ Od. 1, 32.

⁵⁹ Od. 3, 231; 4, 236 and 753; 10, 306; 14, 444.

⁶⁰ Od. 23, 12.

⁶¹ Il. 24, 526.

⁶² Od. 3, 375.

Therefore, let not the rich man boast, but take the gifts of gods in quiet.⁶³

Moreover, gods know all things⁶⁴ and watch over all things; nor do they love wrong doings, but, as honest Eumaios tells us, always reward justice.⁶⁵ Injustice, or sin, is not an inward corruption, but folly or insolence.⁶⁶ Gods punish this insolence and folly. They watch man's good and evil deeds and follow him up, therefor.⁶⁷ Hence old Laertes wonders if there be gods at all, since they have not pounced upon Penelope's overbearing wooers.⁶⁸ His wonder comes at length to an end; the vengeance of gods is meted out to the wooers in full and dreadful measure. Indeed, the idea of divine retribution stands out so prominently that the destruction of evil-doers and of scorners is given as proof positive that gods exist. No evil at all may come from gods; Zeus will not allow the notion that it may.⁶⁹ Man, then, has nothing to fear from gods, the controllers even of destiny,⁷⁰ the guides of every undertaking.⁷¹ Man needs them and must at all times pray for their aid;⁷² and if ever, as Phoenix says, any one do wrong, he must turn the hearts of gods from anger by his incense, vows, drink offerings and burnt offerings.⁷³

Such are a few of those traces of deity which appear ever and anon in the sum of the Homeric poems. If we set these grand attributes by the side of the absurdities of invention, we shall hardly allow that they were turned out from the workshop of a poet's fancy or were made to order as part and parcel of a mythological system based on the deification of nature powers. It remains, then, that what we have named the tragedy of deity, as opposed to the farce comedy of the gods, is a remnant of what we know to have been primitive revealed truth of ages past and gone even before Homer's early days.

Besides these general attributes of deity there are in the poems of Homer minor details of custom, law and story that add to the likelihood of our contention. These details are very numerous; a few will serve our purpose. Blackie calls attention to the great number of stories in which future retribution is impressed on us.⁷⁴

⁶³ Od. 18, 140.

⁶⁴ Od. 4, 379 and 468.

⁶⁵ Od. 14, 83.

⁶⁶ Cf. passages collated by Nägelsbach, p. 270.

⁶⁷ Od. 11, 487.

⁶⁸ Od. 24, 351.

⁶⁹ Od. 1, 33.

⁷⁰ Od. 9, 592.

⁷¹ Il. 16, 688.

⁷² Od. 3, 49.

⁷³ Il. 9, 496; cf. Jebb, "Homer," p. 59.

⁷⁴ "Horæ Homericæ," p. 57.

A few such are the stories of Sisypheos, Tantalos, etc.;⁷⁵ the deathless passage of wronged Menelaos to Elysium;⁷⁶ the punishment of perjury;⁷⁷ the judgments passed by Minos upon souls entering Hades;⁷⁸ the downfall of Ilion and the bloody ending of the wooers. The upright Bellerophon, who held out against the solicitations of the wife of Proitos and was falsely but successfully denounced by her,⁷⁹ is an exact parallel to the story of Joseph solicited by the wife of Potiphar. In regard to customs we may mention as instances in point the whole idea of sacrifice and the sanctifying of the seventh day noted by Eusebius.⁸⁰ The form of Homeric society is in very many points as patriarchial as is that of Old Testament life. Chateaubriand felt that Nestor must have belonged, if not to the same family, at least to the same age, as Jacob.⁸¹ It seemed to him only a step from the palace of Pylos to the tents of Israel. Such grand simplicity marks both Bible and Homer alike. The simplicity of the Bible is that of an ancient priest who has steeped his mind in the wisdom of heaven, and now pronounces from the recess of the sanctuary the measured words of awful truth.⁸² The simplicity of the poet of Chios is that of the worn-out old sailor who has drunk "life to lees," but now is forced to "rest from travel," and sitting by the crackling hearth goes o'er his long and checkered life once more. These few details are only a small fraction of those that show how likely it is that the ideas of primitive revelation were transmitted through the ages of evolution of Pelasgic thought.

But of greater importance is the evidence we get from the very mythology of Homer. Even some of the individual gods of invention show traces of primitive deity. Some are at times—though only at times—omniscient. For instance, Helios is addressed by Agamemnon: "Thou that seest all and hearest all!"⁸³ Poseidon forcees the children to be born of Tyro and himself.⁸⁴ Kirke sees the future of Odysseus.⁸⁵ Athene knows the future, and guides Odysseus thereto.⁸⁶ Again, many of the gods exercise a kind of inspiration of men. Athene inspires Diomedes,⁸⁷ Apollo Hector,⁸⁸

⁷⁵ Od. 11.

⁷⁶ Od. 4, 563.

⁷⁷ Il. 3, 278.

⁷⁸ Od. 11, 568.

⁷⁹ Il. 6, 160.

⁸⁰ "Preparation for the Gospel," 13, 12; Migne, "Greek Fathers," 21, 1103a.

⁸¹ Chateaubriand, "Genius of Christianity," p. 352.

⁸² Chateaubriand, p. 354.

⁸³ Il. 3, 277.

⁸⁴ Od. 11, 249; cf. also Od. 5, 288 and 345.

⁸⁵ Od. 10, 490.

⁸⁶ Od. 13, 306 and 339.

⁸⁷ Il. 5, 124; 10, 507.

⁸⁸ Il. 15, 243; 20, 375.

Iris Achilleus,⁸⁹ Eidothea Menelaos,⁹⁰ Athene Telemachos,⁹¹ and so on.⁹²

In Zeus, the chief god of invention, we may with good reason hope to chance upon even likelier traces of deity of revelation. The father of the gods is not always the miserable, degraded, mythological creature duped and lulled to sleep by Hera on Mount Ida, tricked by Iris,⁹³ saved from chains by the giant Briareus,⁹⁴ and barely a match for Poseidon.⁹⁵ Zeus is at times a divine character that cannot, as Welcker tells us,⁹⁶ have been trumped up by the soaring fancy of a poet nor breathed into the Hellenic theogony by a lover of nature powers. Throughout the Iliad and Odyssey he is an hundred times identified with *δεός* in its meaning of providence or moral governor of the world.⁹⁷ His is the omniscience of deity⁹⁸—what Hesiod calls “the eye of Zeus that seeth all and knoweth all.” He is stronger than all the gods together,⁹⁹ the source of all governing authority¹⁰⁰ and even of fate (*the fate of Zeus*), the distributor of prosperity and adversity,¹⁰¹ the angered judge of men with crooked minds that reck not of his vengeance.¹⁰² By his will he revives the gasping Hector,¹⁰³ and by his wise mind hears prayers said never so far away,¹⁰⁴ and sunders the bow-string of Teucros.¹⁰⁵ Not mortals only, but gods as well, have recourse to him in time of trouble. Even Poseidon asks his permission to destroy the Achaian ramparts¹⁰⁶ and to block the way of the too venturesome Phæacians.¹⁰⁷

We cannot set these divine attributes of Zeus by the side of his contradictory limitations and withhold our assent to his two-fold personality. Cesarotti shows that even ancient critics give this assent. Plutarch, for example, thinks that, whenever Homer speaks of the accomplishment of the will of Zeus and the providence of

⁸⁹ Il. 18, 166.

⁹⁰ Od. 4, 367.

⁹¹ Od. 15, 9.

⁹² Cf. also Il. 5, lines 341, 744 and 838; 14, 353; Od. 5, 95 and 100.

⁹³ Il. 18, 168.

⁹⁴ Il. 1, 399.

⁹⁵ Il. 15, 288.

⁹⁶ Griechische Götterlehre.

⁹⁷ Gladstone, “Studies on Homer,” p. 225.

⁹⁸ Od. 1, 37; 14, 119; 20, 75.

⁹⁹ Il. 8, 17.

¹⁰⁰ Il. 16, 387.

¹⁰¹ Il. 24, 527.

¹⁰² Il. 16, 385.

¹⁰³ Il. 15, 242.

¹⁰⁴ Il. 16, 231.

¹⁰⁵ Il. 15, 463.

¹⁰⁶ Il. 7, 445.

¹⁰⁷ Od. 13, 125.

god,¹⁰⁸ he refers to a deity distinct from Zeus. That deity is, according to Gladstone,¹⁰⁹ a "depository of the principal remnants of monotheistic and providential ideas." How is it Zeus has this two-fold personality? Because in him the Pelasgian meets the Olympian or Hellenic system of religion. The Pelasgian Zeus was very likely even nearer to deity than is the Zeus of the Hellenes. For the Pelasgians had not yet taken up polytheism, when they left Central Asia. Herodotus¹¹⁰ says they had no gods until told by the oracle of Dodona to import them from Egypt. Later came the Hellenes, generally acknowledged to have been of the same stock as the Pelasgi;¹¹¹ and at their coming a new outcrop of polytheistic ideas began to choke and to smother the remnants of monotheism. In the Homeric age this combat of the old with the new ideas was still going on; that age was Pelasgian as well as Hellenic. In fact, Homer at times seems to identify the Pelasgians with the Hellenes. The Homeric Zeus, then, is just what we should expect to find him—a strange mix-up of the grand attributes of the deity of revelation, set off, or rather well nigh utterly hidden, by later Pelasgian importations from Egypt and ingrafted Hellenic inventions. He represents to us a composite picture that defies all other analysis than that we have given; its background is large, deep, awful, grand, still faintly glowing with a warmth of color that reminds us of a dazzling glory past and gone; its foreground is cramped, shallow, trivial, full of littlenesses, dull in coloring, devoid of warmth and glow; its body is an indescribable something made up of contradictions that will never be got to blend.

Our question hitherto has for the most part been limited to the general attributes of deity. May we go more into detail? Are there, for instance, in Homer any traces of the Messiah? Primitive revelation, in whatsoever land we trace it, should ever show forth some distorted remnant of the belief in a Mediator between God and man. Is there, in Homeric mythology, any such distorted remnant? We think there is. The two gods that are the best—out and out the best—of Homer's gods seem very likely to be corruptions of primitive revelation of the Messiah. I mean Athene and Apollo. Let us study these two gods awhile.

Take them all in all, they show forth more traces of the divinity than the whole Olympian set massed together. They are the only gods that are never made ridiculous. Zeus is chained, Hera is wounded; no violence is ever suffered by this blessed pair.

¹⁰⁸ II. 1, 5.

¹⁰⁹ "Studies on Homer," p. 222.

¹¹⁰ "Euterpe," 52; cf. Rev. A. J. Thébaud, S. J., "Gentilism," N. Y., 1876, p. 281.

¹¹¹ Thébaud, p. 308.

Poseidon cannot harm them; he slinks away from Apollo,¹¹² and leaves off nagging poor Odysseus whenever Athene guides the hapless wanderer.¹¹³ Athene acts from a severe sense of duty, unalloyed by the selfish motives that often rule in Olympus; she is never outwitted by an opponent, always knows what it concerns her to know, brings to a happy end every work she sets herself to do. Apollo is never foiled, save only twice, and then by Athene;¹¹⁴ first, when she observes the Trojans making havoc of the Argives in the press of battle and persuades Apollo to stay the fight by a combat man to man of Hector with heaven-sprung Aias;¹¹⁵ secondly, when she guides Diomedes and Odysseus in the Doloneia.¹¹⁶

These two gods receive special honor from both gods and men. Whenever Apollo enters the council chamber of Zeus, the gods rise to greet him.¹¹⁷ Mortals are aware of this honor. Several times does Hector wish he were honored as are honored Athene and Apollo.¹¹⁸ Men often invoke Zeus and these two, rarely others. There is in Homer no invocation of the important gods Aphrodite, Ares, Hephaistos, Hermes and Hera. Penelope calls on Artemis to end her existence;¹¹⁹ Poseidon is invoked by his descendant Nestor, his son Polyphemos and the envoys to Achilleus; Thetis is prayed to by Achilleus.¹²⁰ As for the rest, it is always Zeus, Apollo and Athene that are invoked.¹²¹ To these three gods is directed the remarkable triune invocation, always the same, word for word, letter for letter, with never a change of even a particle, as invariable as the doxologies of the breviary:

Ah, Father Zeus and Athene and Apollo!

This prayer always leads up to mighty hopes and manly feelings. We find it when Agamemnon wishes he had ten such warriors as Nestor,¹²² and, later on, that all his mail-clad Achaians had within their breasts a spirit like to that of the two Aiantes;¹²³ when old Nestor¹²⁴ and Laertes¹²⁵ wish they were young again; when Alkinoos would have Odysseus to be husband of Nausikaa;¹²⁶ when

¹¹² Od. 7, 311.

¹¹³ Il. 21, 468.

¹¹⁴ Od. 3, 55.

¹¹⁵ Gladstone, "Studies on Homer," p. 75.

¹¹⁶ Il. 7, 36.

¹¹⁷ Il. 10, 515.

¹¹⁸ "Hymn to Apollo," 2-5.

¹¹⁹ Il. 8, 540; 13, 827.

¹²⁰ Od. 20, 61.

¹²¹ Il. 1, 352.

¹²² Il. 4, 119; 10, lines 278, 284, 462 and 507; 16, 514; 17, 19.

¹²³ Il. 2, 371.

¹²⁴ Il. 4, 288.

¹²⁵ Il. 7, 132.

¹²⁶ Od. 24, 376.

Menelaos wishes that Odysseus were home among the wooers,¹²⁷ and Telemachos that his mother's tormentors were worse off than Iros,¹²⁸ and Achilleus hopes that not one of all the Trojans nor one of all the Argives may escape death.¹²⁹

Athene and Apollo are the only gods entirely free from the needs of body. Neither sleeps, eats, drinks, rests; is wearied, pained or wounded; shows any signs of sensual passion or physical weakness. They act for and from themselves, nor ever betake them to Zeus for aid. They move unlike the other gods. Hera's horses spring many miles at a pace, or she leaps with strides that hurdle even the topmost peaks.¹³⁰ Hermes flits through the air and skims o'er the crests of the waves.¹³¹ Poseidon fares with swift steps, and is drawn by bounding steeds.¹³² Athene and Apollo never journey at all. They start and there they are; that is all. No matter what the distance be, they cover it in a moment.¹³³

This wonderful pair seem to have power over mortals that is all their own. The gods do not in general appear to one mortal without being seen by all. Athene reveals herself to Achilleus alone,¹³⁴ and Apollo to Æneas.¹³⁵ They even make men. Apollo forms an image of Æneas, and sets it fighting on the field of battle;¹³⁶ Athene forms a like image of Iphthime and bids it appear in a dream to Penelope.¹³⁷

Lastly, these two gods often exercise the very mythological powers sacred to Zeus. Athene wields the thunder.¹³⁸ Only she and Apollo use the aegis, when it is not borne by aegis-bearing Zeus. This dreadful shield is Athene's special armor; it belongs to her as the chariot does to Hera.¹³⁹ While bearing it, she may not be smitten even by the thunderbolt of Zeus.¹⁴⁰ As a rule, only Zeus ushers in important events by such an harbinger as the flight of birds. Yet on the home-coming of Telemachos to Ithaka, Apollo sends him greeting by that fleet messenger, the falcon;¹⁴¹ and as Diomede and Odysseus set out on their famous Doloneia, Athene

¹²⁷ Od. 4, 341; 17, 132.

¹²⁸ Od. 18, 235.

¹²⁹ Il. 17, 97.

¹³⁰ Il. 14, 225.

¹³¹ Od. 5, 49-55.

¹³² Il. 13, 17.

¹³³ Od. 1, 102; Il. 15, 150.

¹³⁴ Il. 1, 198.

¹³⁵ Il. 17, 321.

¹³⁶ Il. 5, 449.

¹³⁷ Od. 4, 796 and 824.

¹³⁸ Il. 11, 45.

¹³⁹ Il. 5, 735; 15, 229.

¹⁴⁰ Il. 21, 401.

¹⁴¹ Od. 15, 526.

cheers them with a heron, which they do not see, but whose flapping wings they hear.¹⁴²

Such remarkable traits easily set these gods apart from all their companions. How shall we explain their mutual relations, this startling consistency in Athene and Apollo? If only one of the pair were so very different from the other gods, we should say that in that one the element of invention had not covered over the element of tradition quite so much as in the rest of Olympians. But the existence of two gods so out of fashion with the troupe that play the farce comedy of Olympos, so near to the deity of primitive revelation, and so at one with each other in character, would be a hopeless solecism past all explanation, did we not get light from primitive revelation.¹⁴³ We consider that, in these two gods we have traces of the Messiah—a distorted remnant of the belief in a Mediator between God and man. How do we make good this opinion? By recourse to the Rabbinical writings. According to these, as Schöttgen tells us,¹⁴⁴ the Messiah was looked forward to under a two-fold title—as the Schechinah, conceived in the feminine, and the Metatron, conceived in the masculine gender—the Logos or Wisdom of God, and the Light or Glory of God.¹⁴⁵ This tradition among the Hebrews is remarkable for its resemblance to the characters of Athene and Apollo. Athene is the Logos, the Wisdom of Zeus,¹⁴⁶ the Pelasgian concept of that which was represented by the Hebraic feminine Schechinah; Apollo is the Light, the Pelasgian concept of that which was represented by the Hebraic masculine Metatron. Why, these Hebrew and Pelasgic traditions go hand in hand! Furthermore, parents are found for all the gods save only these two. Athene is sprung from Zeus without a mother;¹⁴⁷ the Messiah's divine nature is begotten of the Eternal Father. Apollo is born of Leto by no god nor man; the Messiah's human nature is born of woman by no man. And as this woman, in Hebrew tradition, shines by her offspring, so Leto shines only by hers. Yet to Leto are given such varied epithets of praise as no god nor goddess ever received. Of other goddesses, certain epithets are distinctive. Artemis is chaste and fair-tressed, Hera is white-armed and large-eyed. Leto's praises are ever varied, as are the praises of Mary in the Old Testament.

¹⁴² Il. 10, 274.

¹⁴³ Gladstone, "Juventus Mundi," Boston, 1869, p. 269.

¹⁴⁴ Schöttgen, "Jesus der Wahre Messias," Leipzig, 1748, p. 523. In their targums, or Chaldaic paraphrases of the Old Testament, Onkelos and Jonathan often interpret *Elohim* and *Jahve* by *Light of God*, *Glory of God*, *Word of God*. Cf. Cornely, *Compendium Introductionis in Sac. Script.*, p. 100.

¹⁴⁵ Gladstone, "Juv. Mun.," p. 205.

¹⁴⁶ Il. 5, 880.

¹⁴⁷ Il. 5, 880.

Such are the myths of Homer that we deem likely to be traces of a primitive revelation. We claim nothing but likelihood for our argument; yet feel that we have certainly hit nearer the mark of truth than do Rationalists. To some of these worthies hardly a story of the Bible but is a sun-myth or a star-myth. With their cocksureness of principles and recklessness in conclusions, one might readily work up our old John Gilpin's Ride or Gulliver's Yahoos into sun-myths. Is not this saying too much? No, it is not! Judge for yourselves. Why, in a recent work that Charles Morris introduces to the public, even the crucifixion of Christ is made to truckle to a sun-myth! Think of it! Such a stupendous fact of history is said to be the same as Homer's threadbare yarn of Hera bound with fetters and hanging in space between heaven and earth!¹⁴⁸ Oh, the blasphemy of it all!

The conclusion Formby drew with regard to Rome we may apply to Homer.¹⁴⁹ The very myths, by which Rationalists would prove the Bible a story book, swing back as a boomerang and smite these Sanscritizing mythologers with a force not at all expected. The result is that such scholars as Creutzer, A. W. Schlegel and Otfried Müller have all come around to the view that pagan mythology is at root only a corruption of primitive revelation.¹⁵⁰ Out of the same sort of gradual disintegration of monotheistic theology, have in this wise come the demons of the Hindoos; the devs and jins of the Persians; the gods, daimones, nymphs, fauns and satyrs of the Greeks and Romans; the stormy divinities, giants and trolls of cold and rugged Iceland; the dwarfs of the German forests; the imps and elves that tripped in the fairy moonlight of English midsummer nights; the fays and sprites that tricked it all the great world over.

At the dispersion of the Pelasgi from kith and kin of the steppes of Asia, the old-time traditions were separated from the warming rays of their source, their glow and vitality began to ooze out, divine tradition began to disintegrate and to be lopped off piece by piece, new ideas were got from the nations round about—chiefly from the Egyptians and Phoenicians—and were ingrafted upon the well-nigh lifeless monotheistic stock, theology was superseded by theom mythology. The upshot of it all was an out-and-out misconception of the essence of God. He became an odd mixture of the human and the divine. In place of man's being made to the image and likeness of God, God was made to the image and likeness of man—and a revoltingly distorted image at that. Man's bearings towards him-

¹⁴⁸ "Aryan Sun-Myths." Introduction by Charles Morris, Troy, 1889, p. 132.

¹⁴⁹ Rev. H. Formby, "Monotheism, the Primitive Religion of Rome," London and New York.

¹⁵⁰ Hettinger, "Natural Religion," tr. Bowden, New York, 1890.

self, his family and to society at large were all tagged on to the remaining shreds of primitive revelation.¹⁵¹ But things didn't square. However, that mattered little. If De Quincey is anywhere near to the truth when he says that "in the mingled yarn of human life tragedy is never far asunder from farce,"¹⁵² we should not take it as surprising that the Pelasgi and Hellenes added a farce of the gods to the tragedy of deity. Of course, all this changing was not a sudden process, by any manner of means, but a very gradual accretion of the human and obliteration of the divine. Pelasgian religion became humanistic. As a result Hellenism was far more humanistic than theistic, while Hebraism was far more theistic than humanistic. In Hellenism, the beauty of holiness gave way to the holiness of beauty; in Hebraism, the holiness of beauty was smothered over by the beauty of holiness.

This juxtaposition of Hellenism and Hebraism leads us to another question. Is the traditive element of Homeric religion explained solely by stray remnants of primitive monotheism that held out against the principles of destruction? We think not. The likelihood of Hebraistic influence on Homeric religion, held to by Eusebius, but made little of for many centuries after him, is nowadays admitted. Almost every year it is becoming more and more likely that the Hellenes of Homer's age had intercourse with the Hebrews, and that Hebraistic religious ideas infiltrated into the pores of Homeric religion. The Homeric poems were written, according to Nepos, an hundred years before the first Olympiad; according to Apollodorus the Grammarian and Euphorbus the Historian, an hundred and twenty-four years before the foundation of Rome, *i. e.*, about 876 B. C. Relying on these statements, Eusebius, in his *Chronicles*,¹⁵³ claims that the poems belong to the period in which Josaphat ruled over Judah, and Elias and Elisaeus were prophesying. On the face of it, we should suppose that the two greatest peoples of that period had something to do with each other. The Phœnicians had doings with the Hebrews, as we know from the Bible; and with the Hellenes, as Homer tells us. It seems most probable that, through the medium of the Phœnicians, the two great literary nations were brought into contact. Critics used to say there was no writing in the age of Homer, and therefore it could have happened that there was not the intercourse we speak of; no critic says so now. There was writing in the Isles of Greece, even during pre-Homeric days.¹⁵⁴ Evans has clearly demonstrated that communi-

¹⁵¹ Gladstone, "Studies," p. 34.

¹⁵² "Cæsars," p. 37.

¹⁵³ L. II.; Migne, "Greek Fathers," 19, 430.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Rev. Daniel Quinn's article in *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW* for October, 1902.

cation existed between the islands of the Ægean and Babylon. A genuine Babylonian tablet with cuneiform writing has been found in Cyprus. In Colossus, Central Crete, have been found some wonderful clay tablets not unlike cuneiform inscriptions. In some of these tablets are ideographic pictographs, facing either from right to left—in true Hebrew fashion—or in the early Greek style, boustrophedon, from right to left and left to right alternately; in others of these tablets is a linear script whose characters have been found in other islands of the Ægean, in Egypt and in Palestine. Hence, in pre-Homeric days there was communication by writing between the islands of the Ægean and Palestine. Indeed, from the discoveries of Stillman in Central Crete and Evans in Eastern Crete, pre-Homeric intercourse by writing between the Pelasgi and the Hebrews is at the very least most probable. When the Rosetta stone will have been found whereby these writings of the Ægean may be unriddled, then at last, let us hope, will be broken the veil of mystic silence that has long enshrouded the meaning of Homer's myths; then shall we be able to trace back to their source all the nobler elements of Homeric theogony and show with greater satisfaction that revelation is in part the origin of Homeric religion.

WALTER M. DRUM, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

THE MARTYRDOM OF PRIMATE PLUNKETT.

IN the art section of the Cork Exhibition last year the writer saw some articles that seemed somewhat out of place amid the brand-new specimens of embroidery and lace and filigree work and articles of *virtu* that were displayed in glittering profusion in the glass cases and cabinets of the same department. They were a set of old and faded and tarnished ecclesiastical vestments, a bishop's mitre, a rochet, and a pastoral staff. Looking at these curious relics at close range the visitor might have seen fastened to one of them a card intimating that the articles were relics of the Venerable Oliver Plunkett, Archbishop of Armagh, and that they had been lent for exhibition by the Countess of Fingall. Nothing more was said; so that the ordinary passer-by who had never heard, in all probability, anything about Dr. Oliver Plunkett, and probably cared less, would never have known that he was gazing on the faded vestments of a martyr and beholding the mute testimony of a tragedy as shocking as ever stained the annals of human injustice. In the gay and brilliant mazes of a charming scene these quaint and tar-

nished symbols of ecclesiastical dignity looked sadly out of place; and the Catholic might perhaps have viewed their exposition there as something painful and out of keeping with the solemn memories they evoked. Yet, after all, if it did seem irreverent, they must have awakened a spirit of inquiry in some, and this in itself must lead to good. And thus the martyrdom was working out its purpose.

The Countess of Fingall is of the family of the martyred prelate, and of the same name. Those who had the arrangement of the exhibits never thought of stating that the Archbishop of Armagh had suffered martyrdom: perhaps they thought so dreadful a fact had better be kept in the background in the bright atmosphere of a popular exhibition, with its bands, its fireworks and its whirl of amusements. The unthinking crowd would surge by, never troubling itself about a forgotten Archbishop; but the one, more thoughtful and inquisitive, would wonder what these old vestments meant and would proceed, perhaps, to discover who and what the wearer was and what he had stood for. And so might the martyr's blood not have been poured out in vain.

Strange, is it not, to be transported in fancy from a scene so gay and full of sunshine and summer verdure to the gloom of the Catacombs and the dust of forgotten centuries? Yet one glance at these withering insignia, with their tarnished bullion and their fraying lacework, effects the wonder. They flash upon the mind a picture as harrowing as any beheld in that arena "where murder breathed its bloody steam," as thrilling in its constancy for Christ as the recording angel ever noted. As the eye rests on those speaking memorials, they change their hue. They are bleached and made snow-white; they shine like the face of Christ in His transfiguration. They reflect the glory that surrounds the martyr host as they move in adoration before the great white throne. They are emblematic of a martyr nation, as well as a martyr faith.

A twofold interest attaches to the story of Oliver Plunkett. It illustrates not only the malice of the religious code under which Ireland for centuries groaned and bled, but also the contempt for the constitutional law of England under which it was pretended Ireland was in all legal procedure dealt with. The so-called trial which preceded his execution was conducted according to the forms of English law, yet from the very outset that law had been most grossly outraged, in having the accused brought from the country wherein the offenses charged against him in the indictment were alleged to have been committed, to another wherein no charge could be laid against him and in which he had no residence. English law, no doubt, provides for change of venue in jury trials, when-

ever it can be pretended or shown that local conditions are unfavorable for the vindication of justice. But not even in the case of Sir William Wallace was there previously beheld so gross a stretching of this principle as when Archbishop Plunkett was dragged from Dublin to London to be tried by an English court and a Cockney jury. Wallace probably had often been on English soil in the course of his war against English power: there is nothing to lead one to believe that Oliver Plunkett ever did more than pass over it in the course of a journey to Ireland, before he was dragged to London a manacled captive. As an example of tyrannical wrongdoing both in matters of faith and matters of civil law, the student who takes up this remarkable case must find it without parallel in modern history; nor can he fail to note how curiously its cold recital annotates the boast of the most English of the English poets—

A land of settled government,
Where freedom slowly broadens down
From precedent to precedent.

It is exceedingly instructive to examine closely the particular cycle of history under notice, in order to test the sincerity of those critics of the Papacy and the Catholic system who anathematize the former on the ground of arrogance. The Papacy is condemned because it asserts a spiritual supremacy over the children of the Church; and it is further held up to odium because it claimed its proper temporalities. Now, we behold in the case of Ireland a power which was entirely civil in its origin, claiming not only civil supremacy, but spiritual as well; asserting that claim with the most ruthless ferocity for nearly three centuries, and even trampling in the dust its own code of civil jurisprudence in order to vindicate its pretense to own the souls as well as the bodies of a people different from themselves in race, in language and constancy to their religion.

When Dr. Oliver Plunkett was consecrated Archbishop of Armagh, in Rome, he was given a heritage of martyrdom or exile. The primatial see had been foremost in opposing the iniquitous claims of the Crown to spiritual supremacy, and Archbishop Dowdall, the first to face the storm, had incurred a twofold vengeance by reason of his not only denying this claim, but covering with ridicule the apostate bishops, Brown and Staples, in a public disputation on the respective claims of the Mass and the Book of Common Prayer. This famous dispute was held in the hall of St. Mary's Abbey in Dublin, in the same chamber, very likely, wherein the impetuous Geraldine called Silken Thomas erstwhile had flung down his insignia as Irish Viceroy and declared himself henceforth a rebel against the tyrant who had treacherously slain his father in London Tower. This dispute may be regarded as the pivotal event in de-

ciding Ireland's attitude on the portentous problem offered for her solution. It determined unequivocally that her prelates, priests and people took their stand for weal or woe with the Church which Rome had given their forefathers and the faith which Patrick had sown in the ready soil of their fervid minds. The victory of the Archbishop in the keen contest was proved by the rage with which it inflamed the defeated side; and it is a matter for much regret that so important a discussion is only known to the world by brief historical references. In that same ancient Abbey of St. Mary's, which was often the central seat of the English power in Ireland and the place where its governmental policy was frequently settled in council, were stored archives of rare value to the historian, and many of these must have been hidden away, or hastily carried away, or destroyed, when the hurricane of persecution came with a roar upon the doomed land. Portions of the crypt of the venerable pile still remain open to the quest of the antiquary. They are situated many feet below the level of Capel street, and may be reached by staircases at the back of some shops and stores whose fronts open on that thoroughfare. Few who pass along the sidewalks of Capel street imagine that a little below them rise the graceful groined roofs of the substructure of St. Mary's—mayhap of the very halls in which the fortunes of a nation or a reigning sept or powerful feudal house were more than once settled for ever. It is true that these dim crypts are choked to half their ceiling's height with rubbish hardened into solid earth; yet if archæological zeal were directed to the spot, this difficulty might be overcome with comparative ease, and the results of the quest might throw valuable light on many obscure points in Ireland's fortunes during the Tudor period, so full of pathos and heroic constancy and splendid piety. When Ireland again possesses an archæologist and scholar like the late Sir John Gilbert, perhaps the exploration of these interesting ruins may be undertaken and result in the discovery of precious manuscripts connected with this most absorbing epoch in Ireland's history and reveal the course of reasoning by means of which Armagh's intrepid Archbishop, Englishman as he was, overthrew the sophisms of England's King and council. Dowdall suffered much in exile, but he did not attain the martyr's crown. This was reserved for his successors in the primacy, Richard Creagh, Edward McGauvran and Oliver Plunkett.

It is curious that historians differ about the date of Dr. Plunkett's birth. His birthplace is undisputed: it is given as Loughcrew, in the county Meath; but three different years are set down for his nativity—namely, A. D. 1616, 1629 and 1631. He belonged to the noble house of Fingall. But little is known of his family life or

early training, since the period in which his youth was spent was one of the stormiest in Ireland's chequered history. It witnessed the rise and collapse of the Confederation of Kilkenny, with the wars and invasions which the struggle between the King and the Parliament entailed on the unhappy island. We only know that he was educated in the Catholic faith until his sixteenth year by his uncle, Dr. Patrick Plunkett, titular Abbot of St. Mary's, Dublin. He was distinguished from his boyhood for piety and an inclination for the religious life. This inclination developed and deepened as he advanced in life, until to give it just fulfilment he set out for Rome to begin his studies for the ecclesiastical state. For eight years he labored at his task of preparation, in the college for Irish students founded by Cardinal Ludovisi. At the end of that time he graduated as Doctor in Theology, and was soon chosen as Professor of Divinity in the College of Propaganda. It was not merely that he was a brilliant scholar, an able debater and a proficient linguist, but his piety and his sweet suavity and equanimity under all circumstances had commended him to all with whom he had come in contact. The Pope (Clement IX.) had not failed to note these qualities, and when many names were mentioned to him in connection with the vacant see of Armagh, on the death of Dr. O'Reilly, he put them all aside, asking the council why they should entertain the names of unknown persons on the recommendation of anybody, while they had among them one whom they all knew to be the possessor of the very qualities those unknown persons were said to possess. Acting on his own query, His Holiness, of his own motion, bestowed the appointment on Dr. Plunkett. Having accepted the dangerous dignity, he retired for a short time into privacy, that he might duly prepare his soul by prayer and contemplation for the high responsibility to which he was called. In August, 1669, he was solemnly consecrated by the Pope himself. In the Bull of election he was designated Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of the Kingdom of Ireland, and the See of Armagh was described as the "*Ecclesia totius Hiberniæ primatialis*." On this point a great deal depended, inas much as a very large proportion of the new prelate's time and thought was destined to be given to the settlement of the old dispute as to the precedence in regard to the Sees of Armagh and Dublin.

Regulus leaving Rome for Carthage was not more certain of his fate than Archbishop Plunkett when setting out for his native country. He lost not a moment in hesitation as to his course, immediately that he was consecrated. His field of duty lay at home. There it was as though a destroying angel had swept over the land

once fondly known as the island of saints and scholars. And in truth it might almost be said to be literally the case, since the simoom breath of Cromwell's invasion had scorched and blasted everything that was fair and lovely in the sight of God and man. Twenty years of civil war had scourged the country, a confiscation of landed property amounting to a third of the whole soil had left the Catholic remnant a race of paupers; a besom of infernal malice had swept the land clear of her Bishops and driven her priests to hide with the bats and badgers in caves and mountain sheelings. Only the Bishop of Ardagh represented the resident hierarchy; two more, the Bishops of Ferns and Kilfenora, were in exile; all the other sees were unfilled. Archbishop Plunkett, then, had a whole nation, so to speak, for a diocese when he landed in Ireland, and a task almost equal to that of St. Patrick when he essayed the redemption of the island from the bondage of paganism.

There was one circumstance which enabled him to enter on this fight with confidence. He needed no gift of tongues, like the early Apostles. Besides the classical languages, he was fluent in Irish as he was in English. As the greater proportion of the rural inhabitants at that period had no other vehicle of speech, it was almost a *sine quâ non* that whoever came to their spiritual relief should be thoroughly familiar with the vernacular, down to its subtlest distinctions in regard to thought and action.

It was in the month of March, 1670, that the new Archbishop landed in Ireland to assume the mitre that was destined to prove in a figurative sense a new crown of thorns. The Viceroy at the time of his landing was Lord Roberts of Truro, a stern Presbyterian zealot. As he had previously sent out instructions to have the Archbishop seized if he should attempt to land, some precaution was necessary to avoid his emissaries; hence the Archbishop had to go into a secure hiding place for a little time. But a new Viceroy was appointed in the May of the same year, and the religious atmosphere for the time being underwent a change. Lord Berkeley, the incoming ruler of Ireland, was the very converse of his persecuting predecessor. His mission was peace and conciliation; he inaugurated a reign of tolerance and allowed the penal statutes of the Tudors and Stuarts to fall into desuetude; Catholics again were admitted to high places in the military and civil services, as well as to the magisterial bench. Dr. Plunkett would appear to have placed himself in communication with this benevolent ruler, since his biographers declare that he was secretly encouraged by him in the correction of public abuses and, more important still, in the erection of schools, and even given various sums of money to carry on this sorely needed work. How diligent the new Primate was in taking

advantage of the more favorable conditions was proved by the results which he summed up in a pastoral letter dated in the June of the same year, just three months after his arrival. He had held two Synods, he wrote, as well as two ordinations, and in a month and a half had administered confirmation to over ten thousand persons—and in his own province (Armagh) there remained fifty thousand more awaiting the sacrament. This fact gives a vivid idea of the spiritual desolation into which the country had fallen during the preceding period of persecution.

One of the most delicate problems which awaited him in Ireland was the dispute relative to the Primacy. This confronted him at the very outset. The Catholic Bishops having assembled to prepare a loyal address to the Viceroy, Lord Berkeley, the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Talbot, refused to have any part in the proceeding unless he were called to preside and take precedence in the signing of the address. This caused the failure of the meeting, and led to a correspondence and a reference to Rome as the arbiter between the claims of Armagh and Dublin. Armagh won in the final inquest at the Propaganda, and the Pope subsequently decreed the insertion of the words, "*Armacanam sedem, Romani Pontificis auctoritate, totius insulæ principem metropolim constituit*," in the office of St. Patrick's Day.

It is well nigh impossible to conceive what fulfilment of his Primatial duty meant to the Archbishop in those days of persecution, roadless localities, undeveloped civilization, robbers and cutthroats infesting highways and hedges. Those who have read Macaulay's description of the physical and social characteristics of Great Britain at the close of Charles II.'s reign, with its picture of dangerous highways and wretched inns, may easily imagine, when the English mainland was in such a primitive state, what the conditions for travel in the wild mountain districts of Ireland and Scotland must have been. And yet such difficulties and dangers as these presented were faced stoically year after year by this high-souled prelate. He penetrated again and again into the mountainous country and the woods and bogs where lurked the Tories and the Rapparees, in order to reclaim these desperate disinherited from their wild ways and effect reconciliations between the different clans. He visited regularly, somehow—in disguise or openly—not only his own diocese, but those others subject to his primacy. In addition to these arduous and perilous labors he made a visitation of the Hebrides and the neighboring Scottish isles, where the inhabitants were mostly Catholics and spoke the Irish language—that is, the Gaelic, common in early years to both Ireland and Scotland. The hardships of this visitation, both by land and water, owing to the imprac-

ticable character of the roads and bridle paths in winter and the desolate character of most of the country, appear to have been of the most formidable kind. Still no word of complaint from the heroic prelate: nothing but gratitude for such good as he had been enabled to do and for such kindness as he had met with on his dangerous travels.

Not merely was it the fanatical ferocity of Puritan or Presbyterian that made an Irish bishopric a sort of Damien's torture couch at this epoch, but the Church in Ireland itself was seething with distractions and bitter conflicting policies. The party called Remonstrants, led by the sycophantic and turbulent Father Peter Walsh, long held the country in turmoil by dividing the clergy and leading Catholic laity into two camps—one seeking conciliation with the English Government at the expense of the Church's independence in the matter of episcopal appointments and ecclesiastical rights in general—somewhat after the fashion of the subsequent Veto partisans—and the other opposing a vehement front to any such concession to a truculence that, if given some, would be certain to demand more. To assert his authority in quieting these discordant elements, to compose a difference of many years' standing between the Dominican and Franciscan orders, to pacify the country infested by the Tory and Rapparee bands, to save at times the people from actual famine, to procure missionary help for the Catholic Scotch in the isles and in the Highlands, to compose a dreadful feud, a century old, with the clan O'Reilly, to build schools, restore churches, consecrate bishops, ordain priests, Dr. Plunkett labored with astonishing energy and a zeal that knew no pause. And all this under circumstances of danger and secrecy, for the greater part of the time, much akin to those under which the Spanish contrabandisto carries on his hazardous avocation. Those who desire to gain a fuller knowledge of what he did and how he did it must consult Dr. Moran's biography. His reward was the martyr crown—just as he had anticipated ere he set out on his glorious but dreadful enterprise; and as a reward he cheerfully accepted it.

Yet so inoffensive was the course of Dr. Plunkett that those who at length sought his ruin as a political stroke, to exclude the Duke of York from the succession, were completely baffled for a long time. Their endeavor to implicate him in a "Popish plot" in Ireland completely broke down because of the infamous character of the witnesses whom the conspirators employed for the foul work. But they were not to be foiled so easily. There was still a resort—a desperate one—open to them. This was to break through the law, kidnap their intended victim and drag him, contrary to the constitution of England, across the sea to be tried for something

not answerable in any place save the country where it was alleged to have been committed. Eight informers were hired to do the illustrious victim to death; and four of these were fallen clerics, sad to say. These wretches relied on the ignorance of the English jury class on all things relating to Ireland to obtain credence for a story so monstrous in its absurdity as to surpass anything to be found in the *Arabian Nights* or *Gulliver's Travels*. In this confidence they were fully justified by the result. When first a couple of these villains told their story before a London grand jury, the bill was ignored and thrown out, so utterly absurd did it appear to the jurors—for grand jurors in Great Britain are drawn from the best class of people, having usually a good education and high intelligence. Upon this the Archbishop should have been, according to all precedents, set at liberty; but instead he was remanded to prison and kept for seven months in rigorous confinement, denied all visits from his friends and allowed to communicate with none but his jailors. This time he spent in continual prayer; he fasted on bread and water three days in each week. Yet he was always cheerful, and the sweetness of his manner charmed every one who spoke to him, even the roughest of the jail wardens. This is what his fellow-prisoners testified after his death. No hardships seemed to ruffle his serenity or incite him to seek to evade the trials thrust upon him.

Whatever the reasons alleged for the seizure and judicial murder of Archbishop Plunkett, the crime appears to have been in its motive political. It was carried out as part of the scheme by which the Earl of Shaftesbury sought to exclude the Duke of York from the succession and further the cause of the Duke of Monmouth. Dr. Lingard, who is perhaps the most painstaking of all English historians, asserts that the Duke of Ormonde, who ordered his arrest, did so solely on the ground that he was a Catholic bishop, and bore ample testimony to his unimpeachable loyalty. The charge on which he was indicted does not tally with this version of the incident. This charge was, substantially, that he had obtained his see for the express purpose of raising an army in Ireland to coöperate with an army of invasion from France; that he had enrolled seventy thousand men in Ireland with this object; and that he had surveyed all the harbors in Ireland with a view to ascertaining their suitability for the debarkation of troops, and had pitched upon Carlingford, in Ulster, as the most fitting; that he had levied contributions on his clergy for the support of his army, and that he had exhorted the Catholic gentry to take up arms for the recovery of their estates. The Duke of Ormonde, who knew the physical conditions in Ireland as well as he did its political situation, knew perfectly well how wildly absurd were these averments, and he knew

better still the infamous character of the wretches who, acting as the sub-agents of Shaftesbury under the direction of the vile man-hunter, Titus Oates, endeavored to persuade Irish juries to give credence to their flimsy concoction. The juries rejected them; but determined not to be balked of their prey, the principals and the instruments agreed upon the monstrous plan to have the prelate carried out of the kingdom where the treason was pretended to have been committed and brought to England for a fresh trial. There the juries, it was believed, who knew nothing of Ireland or its geography, or the character of the accused, could be easily got to believe any story that seemed to hang together, especially in the inflamed state of the public mind, wrought up by artful devices on the part of Shaftesbury.

These calculations proved the sagacity of those who made them. After having been acquitted in both England and Ireland, he was once more put forward before an English judge and jury, having neither friends nor witnesses to speak for him or prove his innocence. He was allowed a little time to summon witnesses from Ireland, but their arrival was most unfortunately postponed by a long period of contrary winds, and he was forced to stand his so-called trial without them. He had made an affidavit that his messenger was delayed, that his witnesses, again, were delayed owing to the difficulties found in obtaining passports for Catholics, and that the officers in Dublin refused copies of necessary documents without orders from the Privy Council in London; and so on. Judicial decency was not a characteristic of those melancholy days. What the usual behavior of judges was may be gleaned from Macaulay's vivid picture of the trial of Richard Baxter and Lady Alice Lisle before Judge Jeffreys. Violent abuse of the accused, couched in terms of "Tom Jones" sort of English, was one of the regular indulgences of the ermined servants of the Crown. In the case of the Archbishop of Armagh this coarse billingsgate was spared, yet the language of the Chief Justice, Sir Francis Pemberton, was at times severe and opprobrious. Those who sat beside him, Judges Jones and Dolbein, were already noted for their violence of language when sending Catholics to their doom for the crime of fidelity to their faith.

It is a task of the utmost difficulty to form a proper judgment upon this particular period of British history, or decide the spirit that was most influential in the production of its contradictory and bewildering characteristics. It was an age of shocking tragedies, offset, as they presented themselves on the stage of life, by the grossest buffoonery. Religious animosity was never more rancorous, yet moral profligacy was at no period ever so shameless.

Superstition was at no time darker or denser, as those who have read Defoe's chronicles of the plague in London have learned, yet those who were its slaves made the reproach of superstition one of the strongest indictments against the Catholics whom they basely accused of causing the fire which preceded the plague, and would have charged them with the responsibility for the plague as well if they could only get a pretext for the absurdity. Upon such a composite atmosphere of ignorance, bigotry and debauchery, and fetish credulity in signs and omens, the infernal malice of Titus Oates had worked to such effect that no injustice, however palpable, no cruelty, however revolting, could appear in any light save as the natural and proper remedy for the evils of the present or preventatives of those of the future. Therefore the inhuman cruelties which characterized public executions produced on the public mind, or even on those who, standing around the scaffolds, beheld them in all their horrible minutiae, no feeling save that of just and fitting deserts for traitors. The judges who pronounced those barbarous sentences were, in a great many cases, quite as brutal in mind as the hired butchers who carried them into effect. Jeffreys, who presided over the "bloody assize," was a savage who seemed to gloat at the torturing of his victims, ere he sent them to the gallows, with all the ferocious zest of an old Indian squaw; and the trio who conducted the travesty of justice in which the doomed Archbishop was the central figure seem to have been very good imitators of the mode and judicial temper of that dishonored wearer of the judges' ermine.

At that time such was the rigor and injustice of the law on treason that no counsel durst plead for any one accused of the crime, so odious was it made to appear both by the sovereign and the law. It ranked much in the moral scale as leprosy does in the physiological. "The spotted rebel stains the soldier," the phrase that the King flings at Richmond on the battlefield, crystallizes the abhorrence which surrounded the crime, in the days when none disputed the divine right of the monarch. So that, unless some legal technicality cropped up to require a professional disentanglement, no prisoner at bar for treason could get any legal help. Thus it came that when the Archbishop was called upon to plead to an outrageously absurd charge, no valiant counsel, no Curran, no Butt, stood by his side to teach truculent time-serving judges the law and their moral duty. He stood alone and friendless among strangers and ferocious enemies. Nevertheless he deemed it his duty to make a strenuous defense. He produced before the court the documents attesting his loyalty and innocence signed by the two ex-Viceroy, Berkeley and Essex. He endeavored to awaken in the jury some consciousness of the impossibility of the crimes laid to

his charge by a description of the Bay of Carlingford and the obstacles to the landing of any force on its shores. He also dwelt upon the fact that the total incomes of the Irish clergy were not sufficient to equip a single regiment, not to speak of maintaining seventy thousand men, as charged, and all the other wild improbabilities of the tale. But he spoke to men who wanted not the truth, but only his blood.

The band of villains who conspired to earn the blood-money offered by Oates (twelve hundred pounds) for the capture and conviction of the Archbishop were headed by a trio of fallen priests—men whom the prelate, in the exercise of his duty, had had to discipline several years before—"renegades from our religion and declared apostates," as the Archbishop in his speech described them. Their names were McMoyer, Murphy and Duffy. Besides these principals there were several others—Denis (or McDonagh), Fitzgerald, Ivey, Neal or Neill, Bourke, Sanson and a pair of Mac-Namaras. These fellows had been sent over from England originally for the purpose of getting up evidence about the "Popish plot," but only succeeded in getting landed in jail because of bare-faced perjury in accusing the Earl of Tyrone and other high personages of known loyalty. McMoyer, Murphy and Duffy were for a time leaders of bands of rapparees, but were let out by the connivance of the authorities in order to get up "evidence" against the Archbishops and other leading Catholics. Denis was a spy who passed over the European continent in the guise of a Dominican friar. He swore that in 1677, in Madrid, the Archbishop of Tuam, then residing there, said, on getting a letter from Titus Oates (then posing as a Catholic candidate for holy orders), that he (Oates) would be very useful, as Dr. Plunkett was going to introduce French troops into Ireland to support the Catholic cause. All this was purely fictitious.

All the spirit of Shaftesbury breathed throughout the conduct of that awful mockery of justice. From the beginning it was seen that the Crown lawyers had entered into the conspiracy along with the vile gang who for the sake of the reward got up the myth. Sawyer, the Attorney General, in opening the case, said that Dr. Plunkett had been made Primate of Ireland by the Pope for the express purpose of procuring the death of the King and the destruction of the Protestant religion in Ireland! This astonishing disclosure he did not think necessary to substantiate by any sort of proof: his bare word, backed by the oaths of the wretches huddled behind him ready to swear anything required of them, was enough. "We shall prove it," he added; and the proof was the word of these liberated jail birds, not one of whom could ever have had the re-

motest idea of anything that passed at the Vatican, nor ever had been, in all probability, within a thousand miles of Rome.

After the jury had brought in their verdict, a Protestant peer and several other high personages besought him to save his life by renouncing the Catholic religion and accusing others whom he might know to be guilty. The reply was what might have been expected from one who knew no deceit nor fear of torture or death for God. "He knew none," he said, "whom he could justly accuse; and even to save his life he would not falsely accuse any one or endanger his soul."

But the language of the Lord Chief Justice before delivering sentence showed the real animus of this remarkable "political" trial. It proved the whole proceeding to be inspired by the most blind, ferocious religious hatred. "Truly yours," he said, "is treason of the highest kind: it is treason, in truth, against God and your King, and the country where you lived. You have done as much as you could to dishonor God in this case, for the bottom of your treason was your setting up your false religion, than which there is not anything more displeasing to God, or more pernicious to mankind in the world. A religion that is ten times worse than all the heathenish superstitions—the most dishonorable and derogatory to God and His glory of all religions or pretended religions whatsoever, for it undertakes to dispense with God's laws and to pardon the breach of them. So that certainly a greater crime cannot be committed against God than for a man to endeavor the propagation of that religion."

After the lapse of six days the Archbishop was again led to the bar to listen to the sentence of the law. It makes the blood run cold to read it. He was sentenced to be hanged, cut down while alive, disemboweled, his entrails being burned before his eyes, and quartered. He listened to the frightful decree with a placid composure; and during the fifteen days between the sentence and the butchery he occupied his time in prayer, in mortification, in writing to his friends and in penning his gratitude to the Catholics of London who had subscribed money for his defense, for the expenses of his witnesses, and finally to defray the cost of his obsequies when the tragedy which they could not avert should have been completed.

It is said the King was powerfully affected by the sentence. Yet if this were really the case, he should have shown his feelings in some more practical way than throwing the responsibility for the judicial murder on the Earl of Essex. He had the moral courage to prorogue Parliament at the time the attitude of the Commons was most threatening. He was never, in fact, wanting in moral courage

to do what he deemed necessary to carry out his own purposes: it was only when the interests of his friends and supporters were in jeopardy that he fell back on the excuse, "I dare not do it; you could have saved him if you chose; you are responsible."

A few days before his execution Archbishop Plunkett wrote a letter to his friend, the Rev. Gregory Joyce, Canon of St. Gudule's, at Brussels, acquainting him of the dreadful proceedings, but in the most cheerful way. He was about to die, he said, but most willingly. He had no fear, he went on to say; and he marvelled at this courage and wondered why, when even Christ was seized with fear and trembling at His approaching death, he should be free from such a fear. He eagerly desired to be dissolved and be with Christ, he added; and he freely forgave all those who had brought about his doom and besought God also to pardon them. To the Rev. Mr. Corker he also wrote a somewhat similar epistle. The tone of both these letters impress the reader as the perfection of Christian sublimity. It is more than resignation that breathes in them: it is the serenity of the true martyr, anxious to repay the love that impelled Christ to offer Himself as our ransom by a similar sacrifice for His sake.

Father Corker, a Benedictine, to whom he had committed the disposal of his remains after death, was enabled to observe how the Archbishop bore himself during the days preceding his execution, and he set it down in writing in order that all who read might profit by that most touching and edifying example. "It was then that I clearly witnessed in him the spirit of God," he says, "and the amiable fruits of the Holy Ghost—charity, joy and peace splendidly shining in his soul. And not only I, but several other Catholics who came to receive his benediction could attest from their own observation that something divine shone through his words, his actions and mien; a union of cheerfulness, fortitude, charity, sweetness and candor that marked distinctly that the divine goodness destined him (a victim) for heaven. All that saw him were replenished with a new pleasure and a new fervor, and their desires of pleasing God and suffering for Him were singularly inflamed by the sight of the Archbishop."

Father Corker describes the last affecting scene on the way to Tyburn. He says: "I cannot nor should I attempt to describe the extraordinary virtues of this holy martyr: there was something in him more than human; the most savage and obdurate among the people were softened and melted at seeing him, and several Protestants exclaimed, 'O that our souls were with his!' . . . When he arrived at the place of execution he turned toward our chamber in the prison, and, with a countenance beaming with satisfaction

and friendship, he lifted up his holy hands and gave us his blessing."

The fierce irony of this martyrdom is best illustrated in one of its immediate corollaries. Shaftesbury, the arch-conspirator in Oates' infernal plot, was himself laid by the heels on a charge of treason the very next day after his victim's murder, and escaped the same fate only because the jury who tried his case refused to believe the witnesses produced against him—and these were the very same gang whom he had brought over from Ireland to ensnare the Archbishop! But he only escaped the vengeance of heaven for a little while, for he died shortly afterwards in exile, wretchedness of mind and body and the sense of the world's scorn added to remorse of conscience.

The character of the author of all this cruelty and frenzy over the "Popish plot" reveals a depth of savage cynicism which one looks for in vain even in the pages of the Italian romancists. Machiavelli certainly never conceived anything so cold-blooded in scheming savagery. Ashley Cooper, Earl Shaftesbury, was a man of brilliancy, boldness and versatility in politics. He had been everything by turns—a Parliamentarian, a royalist, a Cromwellian, an intriguer with Monk for the recall of the Stuarts, a psalm-singing pietist—"the loudest bagpipe of the squealing train" Dryden termed him. He is the "false Achitophel" of that great poet's religious epic. But he was no sooner a Minister under Charles than he flung himself with zest into the flood of debauchery which was let loose on the downfall of the Puritans. "You are the wickedest dog in England," Charles laughingly said to him one day. "Of a subject, sir, I believe I am," was his audacious retort. In religion he became at length a Deist, holding the fantastic belief that after death the souls of men lived in stars. For a time he was a steady advocate of religious toleration, though his attitude was based entirely on political grounds. But the country was not ready to agree to toleration, and so Parliament forced both King and Minister to drop the idea. After falling out with the King, he began intriguing with the Prince of Orange. All his energies were directed toward the exclusion of James and his issue from the throne, and it was in pursuance of this great end that the monstrous scheme called the "Popish plot" was invented. Such was the man who in pursuance of that scheme sent Lord Stafford, Archbishop Plunkett and many priests and Catholic laymen to the scaffold.

Before closing this shocking chapter of the "Merry Monarch's" reign, it is not uninteresting to trace the fate that overtook the minor villains of the tragedy. In their case, as in that of so many others who had been the means of doing to death innocent lives

consecrated to the highest service of God, the Nemesis of punishment in time overtook almost every one of them and made them a fearful example of the unerring ways of Divine justice. Neal was the first to meet his doom. He was hanged for robbery at Mullingar, and before dying made a formal declaration that there never was such a thing as a Popish plot in Ireland, as pretended, and that all the testimony given relative to such a plot was rank perjury. Another was hanged, also for robbery, at Limerick.

Forty-seven years after the martyrdom an old man presented himself before Archbishop Plunkett's successor. He was a woe-begone, emaciated, decrepit wretch, who seemed to be pursued by invisible enemies. It was the ex-priest Duffy—the principal perjurer of the gang. He cast himself at the Archbishop's feet and begged for forgiveness. The prelate heard his agonized pleading in silence, then pointed to a shrine in the room, saying, "Look there, thou unfortunate man!" The head of the martyr lay before his eyes: he saw it and fell in a swoon. In the end he was forgiven and died penitent. But those years of gnawing remorse was a punishment even more awful than that of the scaffold, which was the last scene of most of the gang's escapades.

As for the monster, Titus Oates, no punishment attributed to the power of the mythical Furies could exceed that which fell on him while on earth. After all his victims had gone to the block or the gallows, he himself was caught in the meshes of his own villainy. Convicted of perjury in the reign of King James, he was sentenced to be stripped of his clerical habit, to be pilloried in the palace yard, to be led around Westminster Hall bearing a placard setting forth his infamy, to be pilloried again in the Royal Exchange, to be whipped from Aldgate to Newgate, and after an interval of five days to be whipped again from Newgate to Tyburn—the spot where his noblest victims had yielded their heads to the executioner. Besides these frightful penalties he was decreed imprisonment for life with quinquennial exposures to popular hate in the pillory. How intense that hatred was the people showed when he was first led forth to undergo his torture. He was pelted with foul things, and would have been torn limb from limb but for the exertions of his guards. The executioner plied the lash with merciless strength all the dismal way; the writhing wretch bellowed like a maddened beast, and several times he swooned under the pain, only to be placed on his feet again and feel the lash cutting into the bone. The description of his sufferings is indeed too horrible to be followed; and not a scintilla of his sufferings would the authorities abate. In effect the sentence was one that the wretch be flogged to death; yet, strange to say, so much was he like a gorilla in frame that he sur-

vived the long-drawn-out torture, seeming like one of the infernal gods in his capacity to endure. About this historic punishment Macaulay is singularly contradictory in his comments. Horrible as his sufferings were, he remarks in one place, they did not equal his crimes. Therefore they were inadequate. Yet says the historian further on: "Nevertheless the punishment inflicted on him cannot be justified." The reason why this inconclusive opinion is put forth was that as the law did not permit the death sentence for the immediate crime with which he was charged, there was a straining of the law and the formation of a terrible precedent for sentences worse than death, in his particular case. From one point of view Macaulay's reasoning is to be commended. No matter what a criminal may deserve, humanity cries out against meting out to him the full measure of his deserts in the way of physical pain, because of its violation of the Divine law and also because of its effect in rendering callous the beholders and participants. But Oates' punishment, though monumental, was not temporary or in the physical part. He achieved an immortality of infamy; he stands alone, branded forever as the incarnation of obsessional villainy and malice; even as his most illustrious victim, Archbishop Plunkett, stands alone, in the circumstances of his martyrdom, by its flagrant breach of the constitutional laws of England and Ireland.

There was a niece of the Archbishop's of whom he was very fond. A few days before his death he had spoken of her affectionately to Father Corker, styling her "little Catherine." In due time she became first head of the Irish Dominican nuns, in Drogheda, and to these ladies was intrusted the shrine containing the head of her martyred uncle.

The casket containing the prelate's head is now in the keeping of the Dominican Nuns at Cabra, in the County of Dublin, Ireland—or at least was there when Father Moran (now Cardinal) wrote his memoir of Archbishop Plunkett. The face is in a fine state of preservation. His body is in the keeping of the Benedictines at Lanspruck in Germany. The Dunsany branch of the Plunkett family have several heirlooms of the martyr, including his watch; and the descendants of his faithful servant, to whom he presented his beads as he mounted the scaffold, still preserve the memento with the deepest reverence. The body (that is, the trunk)—strange to say—was found, four years after death, to be intact—notwithstanding that it had been ripped open to the breast by the executioner, previous to disembowelment. Many miracles are said to have taken place at his grave. The question of his title to martyrdom was raised soon after his murder, but for prudential reasons was for the time being postponed. It seems likely to be decided

in the immediate future. His cause is still incomplete, but there is good reason to believe it will not long remain in that condition. About his martyrdom there can be no doubt whatever ; in fact, there appears never to have been ; and concerning his "fama sanctitatis" the evidence seems equally convincing.

J. J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

Scientific Chronicle.

RADIUM AND RADIOACTIVITY.

Radium and its congeners continue to be the well nigh all-absorbing topic of the scientific press. New facts regarding these wonderful substances are being brought to light constantly, and scientists are looking about for an explanation of the phenomena which they exhibit. It is gratifying to know that progress is being made and that some of the facts at least have been correlated with some previously well known.

Of the three kinds of rays emitted by radium, the B-rays are recognized to be the same as cathode-rays of high velocity approaching that of light, while the J-rays are very probably X-rays which accompany the production of the B-rays and have a high penetrating power. The A-rays are the most important of the three. Rutherford found that these could be deviated by a magnet or by electricity, but that the deviation was about one thousand times less than that of the B-ray and in the opposite direction. "From this he concluded," to quote Mr. Frederick Soddy, "that they consisted of projected particles carrying a positive charge about one thousand times the mass of the cathode-ray particle, and therefore comparable in size to the hydrogen atom, traveling with a velocity one-tenth that of light. This confirms in a remarkable manner the view of the nature of electricity adopted by J. J. Thomson . . . that the negative charge can be dissociated from the atom, whereas the positive charge is always associated with a particle of atomic dimensions." It will be remembered that J. J. Thomson's corpuscle is a negative particle one thousand times less in mass than the atom of hydrogen, which is electro-positive.

There is trouble over the atomic weight of radium. As a result of some years of labor Mme. Curie gave the value 225 as the result of an experimental determination, but Messrs. Runge and Precht, from spectroscopic observations, give the value 257.8. Of course, their determination was indirect. But such a discrepancy has never occurred before with any of the other elements when examined for their atomic weight by the same methods. What is wrong?

Recently Messrs. Rutherford and Barnes, in a paper presented to the American Physical Society, gave some figures regarding the energy of the emanations from radium that are worth transcribing.

One gram of radium, in the course of the various changes which it undergoes, yields in the aggregate between two millions and twenty millions of greater calories, a "greater calorie" being one thousand times a "calorie." Think of what this means! The energy liberated by coal in combustion is nothing in comparison, being only eight greater calories per gramme. If we were to take a piece of coal of a certain size, and were to burn it, enough energy would be liberated to raise the piece itself a distance of two thousand miles, about the distance between New York and Panama, vertically upward against constant sea-level gravitation. The same amount of hydrogen would yield enough energy to lift itself four times as far, about the distance from New York to Manila. But an equal amount of radium would yield enough to lift it to the orbit of the planet Neptune, which revolves at a mean distance from the sun of 2,800,000,000 miles. If such a store of energy could be made commercially available, it might revolutionize industry.

Perhaps one of the most interesting facts in regard to radium has been the discovery of its emanations in the gases given off from certain mineral springs, notably at Bath, in England. It was found, besides, that helium was given off also. The discovery that the radium emanations change spontaneously into helium led to the suspicion that radium might be found in the deposits about the springs. An examination by the Hon. R. J. Strutt, son of Lord Rayleigh, showed this to be the case. Radium was present in appreciable quantities, although not commercially appreciable. A similar result, at least in regard to the emanations, has been achieved by some professors of Yale University with some spring water from the vicinity of New Haven, Conn. Professor Himstedt, of Freiburg University, Germany, announces that he has found a heavy specific gas not unlike and probably identical with the radium emanations in the products of water and petroleum sources. And another experimenter announces that radioactivity exists in the petals of several odoriferous flowers.

In this connection it will be worth while mentioning another kind of rays, the *n*-rays, so called from the place of their discovery, the University of Nancy. Professor Blondlot is their discoverer. They are given off, it is claimed, by an incandescent Welsbach mantle and from other sources of light, from a bent bow, and accompany the sunlight. They are detected by the increase of phosphorescence they produce in a screen of calcium or barium sulphide, and can be reflected, refracted and condensed by a lense just as ordinary light. It is asserted by M. Charpentier that *n*-rays are emitted by the brain and nerve centres of the human body. On the other hand, the existence of these rays is denied by other careful experimenters.

It may be interesting to know that M. and Mme. Curie have been awarded the Davy medal by the Royal Society of England for the most important discovery in chemistry during the year. They have besides received 20,000 francs from the Institute of France, the Nobel prize of 40,000 francs, and it is said that a chair of physics will be instituted at the Sorbonne to which M. Curie will be called. And there you are!

AERIAL NAVIGATION.

From the time that Daedalus took his fancied flight from Crete, and doubtless before that time, too, mankind has always been interested in the navigation of the air. Not until comparatively recent times, however, has any success been achieved in this direction. Spherical balloons were a failure as far as control of their movements was concerned; so they were abandoned in favor of the elongated type, and the attempt was made to apply to these some light and efficient motive power. The average reader is apt to imagine that this was attempted only within the last decade. Perhaps this is due to the remarkable achievements of M. Santos-Dumont, which have held such a large share of public attention during the last few years. But the fact is that Giffard, in 1852, built an airship with a motor, in which he attained a speed of 6.71 miles an hour. Dupuy de Lome followed in 1872 with a balloon driven by man-power. He was less successful, as far as speed was concerned, than Giffard. Tissandier had an electric motor in 1884 attaining a speed of 7.82 miles an hour. In 1885 the Aeronautical Section of the French War Department, under the direction of Messrs. Renard and Krebs, brought out "La France," which reached a speed of approximately 14 miles an hour. This was a decided advance, so in 1893 the "General Mensnier" was built. This last was never taken out. If equipped with a present-day gasoline motor, it could reach 30 miles an hour, a very respectable speed.

In Germany the most conspicuous success was that of Count Zeppelin, who, although his 420-foot air-ship was not as efficient as he had hoped, had still some good constructional features embodied in his machine; and he will probably try again.

The achievements of M. Santos-Dumont are fresh in mind. The evolution of the gasoline motor to its present state of perfection was no small factor in this inventor's success. He has a small air-ship

now in which he rides about, as many another young man takes his pleasure in an automobile. And they say he is constructing an omnibus, for rides in which fares are to be charged per pound of passenger. This will be the tenth air-ship M. Santos-Dumont has designed and built. He has not been the only one to achieve success. This year the Lebaudy brothers built a vessel which attained a speed of 24 miles an hour, it is said. Mr. Spencer and Mr. Beedle have had considerable success in England.

These dirigible balloons have the advantage that the motor may expend its power almost entirely in propelling the machine. Suspension is cared for by the inflated bag. But on the other hand this must be of great size, and must combine great lightness with great strength. The tendency to buckle, especially when the wind is "head on," is a difficult one to overcome. Then again the proximity of fire to an inflammable gas, brought about by the use of a gasoline motor, is a fatal objection to this style of air-ship. The terrible death of Dr. Wölfert in Germany in 1897 and that of M. Severo in Paris in 1902, both caused by the gas in the balloon taking fire from the motor and exploding in mid-air, shows that there is ground for the fears aroused by the proximity spoken of.

In the estimation of thousands who advocate the aeroplane, in some form or other, as the means of solving this difficult problem, these objections have the greatest weight. These gentlemen hold that we must not long to be buoyed up in our aerial flight; we must make the air do some of the work for us, as the birds manage to do. Every boy knows that if a flat piece of paper be placed against the open hand and pushed forward with sufficient speed, it will remain in this position without any support as long as the forward impulse is continued. Simply enlarge this conception; think of a flat surface of any material combining strength and lightness and some hundreds of square feet in extent, add to it a rudder and some adequate motive power and you have an outline of the ideas of the aeroplanists.

The foremost difficulty confronting these inventors lies in the fact that an enormous motive power is necessary. How to secure this and not make the machine too heavy to rise and carry some weight besides its own is the question.

Up to last year three names were prominent in the attempt to find an answer to this question, Sir Hiram Maxim, Mr. Ader, a French electrical engineer, and Professor Langley, of the Smithsonian institution in Washington. The attempts of these gentlemen were unsuccessful; not wholly so, however. A want of stability seems to have been the trouble. Perhaps this remark does not apply to Professor Langley's air-ship tested last year, because the

machine was upset at launching, and thus its failure did not result from any apparent defect in the mechanism. But be that as it may, the stability has not been proved, and stability is a prime requisite in a flying-machine. Coupled with this, the apparatus must be under the control of the operator, who must have acquired experience in managing it. This was the idea with which Lilienthal began his experiments in 1891, after publishing a book which has become a classic on the subject. He built several machines, used gravity for a motive power and became very expert in gliding, making some two thousand flights in the interval between 1891 and his sad death in 1896. His machine was improved upon by a Mr. Pilcher, an English marine engineer, and still further by Mr. O. Chanute, of Chicago, Illinois, from whose article in the February issue of the *Popular Science Monthly* many of our facts are taken. But the greatest improvement, and, we are glad to add, the greatest success, was reserved for two brothers, Messrs. Wilbur and Orville Wright, who in last December achieved such a remarkable result with their aeroplane.

As a preliminary they mastered all the principles of flying as yet discovered, and then set to work to gain experience in gliding. For nearly four years they continued their practice, using machines of various types. They made two radical changes, by placing the rudder in front, where it is of greater service, and by assuming an horizontal position on their machine, instead of hanging vertically from it, as did Lilienthal, thus diminishing by four-fifths the resistance offered by their bodies to the wind. And when they could guide their apparatus as they willed, they added a motor of their own construction, for none of those on the market would serve their purpose. Their longest flight was over a distance of a little more than half a mile, and they reached a speed of from 30 to 35 miles an hour.

This result, while very gratifying, does not mean that existing methods of conveyance for passengers and merchandise must give way to the flying-machines. As Mr. Chanute very wisely remarks, their use and the use of dirigible balloons, when perfected, must, from the very nature of the case, always remain limited. If we consider for a moment that a locomotive can haul about 4,000 pounds per horse power upon a level track, and a steamer can propel a displacement of 4,000 pounds per horse power on the water at a speed of 14 miles an hour, and then think that the power required in a flying-machine of either type will always be about one horse power per hundred pounds of weight, we can soon realize that the golden dream of a transatlantic service through the air at the rate of three days per journey is not likely ever to be realized.

A PHOTOGRAPH OF THE MOON.

A recent publication of great interest to the public and of importance as well as of interest to astronomers is the work of Professor W. H. Pickering, of Harvard College Observatory, on the moon. It is accompanied by a photographic atlas, which presents the whole surface of the satellite in a series of eighty photographs, on a scale of 160 miles to one inch. The way in which the photographs were secured is instructive. Professor Pickering recently went to Jamaica in charge of a party to photograph the moon. The surface was divided into eight parts above and below the east and west diameter by dividing this diameter into eight equal parts and erecting perpendiculars at the points of division. Each of these parts was then photographed five times, once at lunar sunrise, once two days after sunrise, once at lunar noon, once two days before lunar sunset and once at lunar sunset. The work was distributed over some seven months. When the negatives had been secured prints were made, enlarged and reduced again, so as to have an approximate diameter of 13.7 inches, just one ten-millionth of the diameter of the moon, the scale resulting being mentioned above. The outcome has been gratifying, and the pictures are said to be very perfect and full of nice detail.

The book is written in a popular way, but is scientifically accurate. The author propounds some views entirely new and extends some old ones. We have been led to look upon the moon as a dead member of the solar system. Professor Pickering holds that we should no longer regard it as such, for, he says, it has an atmosphere, there are signs of something like snow, indications of volcanic activity and an appearance of something that looks much like vegetation. Let us consider briefly the arguments in favor of the existence of each of these.

It may be said that, in regard to the presence of an atmosphere on the moon, astronomers have always spoken cautiously. They have not absolutely denied its presence, but have rather held that if any existed it was extremely rare, so that it would produce at the moon's surface a barometric pressure not exceeding 1-25 of an inch of mercury or 1-750 of the atmospheric pressure at the earth's surface. They reach this conclusion from the fact that when viewed through the telescope there is no distortion of the edge of the moon's disc, as there would be in case an atmosphere existed; there is no haze visible, and the shadows cast by the elevations of the moon's surface are all sharp and jet black. Then there is no refraction apparent when the moon occults a star, which is not compatible with a dense atmosphere like that of the earth. However, when a

bright planet such as Jupiter is occulted by the moon a dark band, tangent to the moon's disc, is always seen stretched across the planet. That this indicates absorption of some kind seems evident, especially as nothing of the kind is seen at the moon's dark limb, indicating a condensation to solid form of the absorbing medium at this side of the moon, where the temperature is held to be not far from 460 degrees below zero Fahrenheit, the probable temperature of interplanetary space.

The moon's atmosphere probably consists of carbon-dioxide and water vapor, its surficial gravity not being sufficient to retain the lighter gases of our atmosphere. But it is also probable that even carbon-dioxide and water vapor would have to be constantly renewed from the moon's interior.

Now if an atmosphere such as the one described exists there is a possibility that we should see some evidence of snow. And so we do. White patches are seen in some of the craters and on top of some of the lunar peaks. In some regions these disappear as the lunar day grows longer and exhibit all the phenomena of melting snow.

Another notion of ours, that the moon's craters are extinct, Professor Pickering thinks we may have to part with, for he has studied an appearance much like a mass of cloud that arose from the bottom of what we know as Schrooter's valley and poured over its south-east wall. Other observers have thought they saw signs of volcanic activity, but no exact determination has been made. It may be that such eruptions supply the material for the moon's atmosphere. If this consists of water and carbon-dioxide, why may we not have vegetation? Our author thinks that we have. There are certain dark markings visible which are variable, growing darker and smaller as the sun rises and fading towards sunset. Organic life, he says, resembling vegetation, is the best explanation of this variation. Plant life may explain, too, the so-called "canals," visible on the moon as well as on Mars, with whom they have usually been associated.

NOTES.

COMETS DUE THIS YEAR.—There are four comets, whose periods are well determined, expected to return to perihelion this year—Winnecke's, D'Arrest's, Temple's second and the famous one of Encke. It is not likely that any one, except the last mentioned, will be easily visible. Encke's should be seen in September, but

in November it will be comparatively close to the earth and should be conspicuous with a telescope. The period of this comet is $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, but since the discovery of its periodicity in 1819 it has decreased its period by nearly two and a half days, or about two and a half hours per evolution. Under favorable circumstances it may be visible with the naked eye, having a tail a degree or two long. It is barely possible that Winnecke's may be seen, but the chances are that it will not.

THERMITE.—Some few years ago Dr. Goldschmidt, of Essen, discovered that if a mixture of pulverized aluminum and a metallic oxide, oxide of iron, for example, be ignited at one point, the combustion will go on without combination with atmospheric oxygen, and with the development of a temperature estimated at 3,000 degrees centigrade, 5,432 degrees Fahrenheit. In the course of the reaction the oxide is reduced, the pure metal remaining with an oxide of aluminum or artificial corundum. This mixture of aluminum and iron oxide has been called "thermite," and has been used commercially for a variety of useful purposes, especially welding. A mould is built about the joint to be welded, and above an opening in the top of this mould is placed a conical crucible lined with magnesia. In this crucible the thermite is placed and fired. The molten iron runs out beneath on to the joint, which is quickly welded. In this way rails, broken locomotive driving wheels and even a fractured stern-post of a Hamburg-American liner were welded in a few hours. The repair shop is thus carried to the break instead of having the entire broken part carried to the repair shop.

STERILIZING WATER BY OZONE.—The sterilization of water by means of ozone is now effected for entire cities in Europe. The ozone is derived from the air, which is made to flow between two electrodes in active discharge. It is then led to the base of towers down through which the water percolates over stone and sand, thus meeting the rising stream of ozone. This method of purifying water could be advantageously used in some of our own cities.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

NEW PUBLICATIONS OF GINN & Co., BOSTON:

- THE CORONA SONG BOOK.** A choice Collection of Choruses designed for the use of High Schools, Grammar Schools, Academies and Seminaries. Comprising Part Songs and Choruses, Oratorio Selections, Selected Hymns and Tunes, National and Patriotic Songs. Selected, Compiled and Arranged by William C. Hoff, Director of Music in the Public Schools of Yonkers, N. Y. Quarto, pp. 362. Price, \$1.00. By mail, \$1.20.
- TENNYSON'S POEMS.** Edited by Henry Van Dyke Murray, Professor of English Literature in Princeton University. 12mo., pp. 490. Price, 90 cents. By mail, \$1.00.
- THE SHIP OF STATE.** By those at the Helm. 12mo., pp. 264.
- LESSONS IN PHYSICS.** By *Lothrop D. Higgins, Ph. B.*, Instructor in Natural Science in the Morgan School, Clinton, Conn. 12mo., pp. 379. Illustrated. Price, 90 cents.
- GEOGRAPHICAL INFLUENCES IN AMERICAN HISTORY.** By *Albert Perry Bingham*, Professor of Geology in Colgate University. 12mo., pp. 366. Illustrated. Price, \$1.25. By mail, \$1.40.
- STORIES OF THE ANCIENT GREEKS.** By *Charles D. Shaw*. 12mo., pp. 264. Illustrated. Price, 60 cents. By mail, 70 cents.
- A FRENCH READER.** Arranged for Beginners in Preparatory Schools and Colleges. By *Fred Davis Aldrich, A. M.*, and *Irving Lysander Foster, A. M.* 16mo., pp. 304. Price, 50 cents. By mail, 55 cents.
- FLORA OF PENNSYLVANIA.** By *Thomas Conrad Porter*, late Professor of Botany in Lafayette College. Edited with the addition of analytic keys by John Kunkel Small, Curator of the Museums and Herbarium of the New York Botanical Gardens. Octavo, Cloth, pp. xv.-362. List price, \$2.00; mailing price, \$2.15.
- POETRY OF THE PEOPLE.** Comprising ballads, lays of heroism, and other poems illustrative of the history and national spirit of England, Scotland, Ireland and America. Completely equipped with Notes, Glossary and Indexes. By *Charles Mills Gayley*, Professor of the English Language and Literature, and *Martin C. Flaherty*, Assistant Professor of Forensics in the University of California. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth, pp. xvii.-403 pages. List price, 50 cents; mailing price, 60 cents.
- THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE and the Exploration, Early History and Building of the West.** By *Ripley Hitchcock*. 12mo., pp. 349. Price, \$1.25.
- IRVING'S LIFE OF GOLDSMITH.** Standard English Classics Series. Edited by Charles Robert Gaston, Teacher in the High School Department of Public School No. 52, New York City. Semi-flexible cloth, 16mo., xxix.-374 pages. List price, 40 cents; mailing price, 50 cents.
- TENNYSON'S GARETH AND LYNETTE, LANCELOT AND ELAINE, AND THE PASSING OF ARTHUR.** Standard English Classics series. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Willis Boughton, Teacher of English in Erasmus Hall High School, New York City. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth, pp. xxxvii.-129. List price, 25 cents; mailing price, 30 cents.
- MEDIAEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY.** Part II. The Modern Age. By *Philip Van Ness Myers*. 12mo., pp. 650.

It is a pleasure to handle the publications of Ginn & Co. They are always gotten up in the most commendable manner. These publishers understand the value of the material part of a book. They realize that a student can be attracted and held by a book that is convenient in form, neat in appearance, well printed, well illustrated, well bound, much more effectually than by a book which has none of these qualities, although both may contain the same matter. Unconsciously one is predisposed to estimate the value of a book by its appearance, for good thoughts are worthy of a becoming

dress. It is still true that we must not judge a book by its cover, although the word "alone" might be added to the adage, but it is also true that the cover and other material parts of a book can help us to learn its lessons and appreciate them.

1. "The Corona Song Book" has these special advantages: First, the selections are arranged in two, three and four parts, and are thus available for use in all grades of the grammar school as well as of the high school. Then each selection has an independent piano accompaniment, an entirely new feature in the part of the book devoted to hymns. Third, the best composers, particularly of the lyric school, are represented by pieces of harmonic and melodic excellence. Fourth, the book is modern in arrangement and material, and is well adapted to meet modern conditions. These qualities are owing largely to the wide experience of the author in schools which have done much to raise to a high plane the teaching of music. Finally, the selections, both of music and of words, have been made with the friendly assistance and criticism of many of the leading composers and musicians of the country.

2. "Tennyson's Poems." This volume, including one hundred and thirty-six selections, presents within a small compass the best of Tennyson's poems. Set apart from the mass of Tennyson's productions, they make the task of the student simple by leading him without confusion to appreciate thoroughly the vital meaning of the poet's work. The collection is thoroughly representative, showing the poet at the various stages of his literary development. The book includes an introduction giving a sketch of Tennyson's relation to his times, an account of the poet's life, a description of the way in which he worked and finally a summary of the leading characteristics of his poetry.

3. "The Ship of State" is made up of a series of articles by prominent men, either at the present time or formerly government officials, dealing with all the important departments of our government. President Roosevelt, ex-Congressman Thomas B. Reed, Associate Justice Brewer, ex-Secretary Long and ex-Secretary Day are among the contributors, each writing on that department of government with which he is most familiar.

4. Higgins' "Lessons in Physics" provides a thorough course in physics for schools which offer little or no laboratory work. Principles are explained by references to common or familiar phenomena rather than to set laboratory experiments. In fact, throughout the work the central aim has been to give the student an intimate knowledge of the physical manifestations that are most commonly

met in our daily experience. Commercial and industrial uses of the various principles are mentioned and discussed in connection with the principles themselves. As a whole this is a text-book designed to present without required laboratory work a comprehensive view of the subject of physics in a manner which will be interesting and at the same time strictly accurate.

5. "Geographic Influences in American History." In this new book Professor Brigham has presented vividly and clearly those physiographic features of America which have been important in guiding the unfolding of our industrial and national life. The arrangement is mainly geographical. Among the themes receiving special treatment are: "The Eastern Gateway of the United States," "The Appalachian Barrier," "The Great Lakes and American Commerce," "The Civil War" and "Mines and Mountain Life." Closing chapters deal with the unity and diversity of American life and with physiography as affecting American destiny.

6. "Stories of the Ancient Greeks" includes many of the charming tales of the Greek mythology retold in a manner suitable for young people. The second part of the volume deals more particularly with Greek history. The familiar stories are given in chronological order. The style is simple, picturesque and vivacious. The twenty-five full-page illustrations, from original decorative pen drawings by George A. Harker, are unusually attractive and really help to explain the text. The special cream tinted paper, the attractive binding and artistic arrangement of type and illustrations give a pleasing and appropriate setting to the text.

7. "Aldrich and Foster's French Reader" is adapted either to accompany or to follow elementary grammatical work in secondary schools and in colleges. Among its valuable features the following are worthy of special attention. In the first place, the selections are interesting from a student's point of view. The vocabulary has been prepared to meet the demands of the text at hand, and furnishes practically all the data the student requires. As a supplement to the vocabulary, notes appear in places where the pupil is peculiarly apt to go astray or to be satisfied with a poor translation. Every verb found in the early selections is given in the vocabulary, and the notes coöperate in bringing these first pages within reach of one who has no grammatical knowledge—without, however, inconveniencing the more advanced student. Finally, there is an appendix which contains the inflection of regular and irregular verbs, an outline of the subjunctive and a unique and valuable feature, lists of words and idioms to be used in review and in the acquisition of a definite vocabulary.

This reader is particularly suited to accompany and supplement the "Foundations of French," by the same authors, in which they have sought to present and illustrate only so much of the grammar as is required for a complete reading mastery of French, and in which the material is so arranged and condensed that it can be covered in from forty to sixty hours.

8. The "Flora of Pennsylvania" contains descriptions of practically all the plants that are to be found in Pennsylvania. It is a scholarly work and one which bears evidence of the painstaking care lavished upon it by the author.

9. "Poetry of the People" is intended chiefly for use in schools. It contains 416 pages, and for convenience is divided as follows: Book First, "The Older Ballads." Book Second, "Poems of England." Historic and patriotic, Miscellaneous songs and ballads. Book Third, "Poems of Scotland." Historic and patriotic, miscellaneous songs and ballads. Book Fourth, "Poems of Ireland." Historic and patriotic, miscellaneous songs and ballads. Book Fifth, "Poems of America." Historic and patriotic, miscellaneous songs and ballads.

10. "The Louisiana Purchase" gives in a succinct and convenient form a clear and simple history of the discovery, the acquisition and the earlier stages of the building of the West. The first part carries the history from the discovery of Columbus through the periods of Spanish and French ascendancy, and ends with a vivid account of the dramatic incidents which culminated in the Louisiana Purchase. Then follows in an abbreviated form the narrative of the wonderful journey of Lewis and Clark. The third part of this history sketches the important exploration of the West; the journeys of men like Pike, Hunt and Fremont. In the closing chapters something is said of the political and economic development involved in the permanent occupation and settlement of the West. The book is attractively bound and contains numerous illustrations, chiefly drawn from early sources.

GESCHICHTE DES VATIKANISCHEN KONZILS von seiner ersten Ankuendigung bis zu seiner Vertagung. nach den authentischen Dokumenten dargestellt von *Theodor Granderath, S. J.*; heraus gegeben von Konrad Kirch, S. J.

In literary circles the history of the Vatican Council will always remain inseparably connected with the names of two Jesuit fathers, both of whom may be said to have sacrificed their lives in the laborious work of editing. First came Father Schneemann, the founder

of the "*Collectio Conciliorum Lacensis*," who succumbed to his severe labors in 1885, just as the seventh volume containing the Acts of the Vatican Council were running through the press. Those who are acquainted with the "*Lacensis*" can readily understand how such a herculean task demanded a victim. Father Schneemann's work was taken up by his colleague, Father Granderath, under whose careful supervision the seventh volume of the "*Lacensis*" appeared in 1890. Thereupon Father Granderath devoted his energies to the compilation of a History of the Council, the materials for which lay in bewildering abundance in the Vatican archives. His work was nearly ready for publication in three volumes, when he fell exhausted and departed this life in the arms of St. Joseph, March 19, 1902. The labor of editing the author's manuscript devolved upon Father Kirch, who has now given us through the press of Herder the first two volumes and promises the third and concluding volume in the near future.

Needless to say, this history is a model one in every way and altogether worthy of its great subject. To have said that it comes to us from Herder sufficiently guarantees its typographical accuracy and beauty. Evidently the publisher anticipates a very large sale, since he has placed the price of both volumes combined at the low figure of \$3.25. Father Schneemann is a perfect master of historical art. The narrative in his hands marches on with a stately dignity that recalls the old classical authors. The first volume deals with the transactions preparatory to the gathering of the great assembly; the second with the proceedings in and out of Council till the close of the third public session, in which the "*Constitutio de Fide Catholica*" was promulgated. The climax of the work, the promulgation of Papal infallibility, will constitute the subject of the concluding volume, which is to appear in the course of the present year. Our only grievance against the learned author is that in writing what may be regarded as an official history of the greatest of Councils he has not chosen the official and universally understood language of the Church.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS—1493-1898. Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and their Peoples, their History and Records of the Catholic Missions, as related in contemporaneous Books and Manuscripts, showing the Political, Economic, Commercial and Religious Conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the close of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the Originals. Edited and Annotated by Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, with historical introduction and additional notes by Edward Gaylord Bourne. With maps, portraits and other illustrations. Large 8vo., fifty-five volumes. Vol. VIII., 1591-1593, pp. 320; Vol. IX., 1593-1597, pp. 329. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co.

Volume VIII. of this great work is filled with the important events of 1591-92. The correspondence between the Bishop and

the Governor seems to indicate serious dissensions, and the author speaks of them as if they were serious, but it must be quite plain to any one who approaches the history unbiased that they were only differences of opinion about the management of affairs and about the relative rights of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. We have not noticed that the Bishop encroached upon the rights of the Governor to any serious extent, but the latter was very much inclined to interfere with the duties and prerogatives of the former, and it was quite necessary for the Bishop to resist such encroachment.

It is very gratifying to hear both these superiors insisting on the absolute necessity of teaching Christian doctrine to the natives, because there can be no true civilization or progress without it.

Here we find a Papal Decree freeing the Indian slaves in the islands, and ordering that restitution be made to them as far as possible for any injustice done them. Explorations in Luzon are pushed, the Chinese become dangerous competitors in commerce, and the Emperor of Japan demands tribute and homage from the Spaniards of the islands.

In Volume IX. the first quarter century of the history of Manila as a Spanish settlement is completed. It has made good progress and is prosperous. It is fairly well fortified; its public institutions are increasing; it is the seat of an Archbishop, and three other dioceses have been formed from it.

The desire of conquest is spreading among the Spaniards; the Japanese continue to threaten; the increasing number of the Chinese renders them dangerous, and the probability of a rebellion on the part of the natives is becoming more imminent.

This brief outline is sufficient to show that the interest which was started with the first volume has not ceased, and it will, no doubt, continue until the end.

THE PARISH PRIEST ON DUTY. A Practical Manual for Pastors, Curates and Theological Students preparing for the Mission. I., The Sacraments. By *H. J. Heuser*, Professor of Theology, Overbrook Seminary. 12mo., pp. ix.-142. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The title of this book describes it accurately. Definitions do not always define, nor do titles always explain, and therefore we think it well to remark that the title in this case describes the book. More than that, the fitness of the title indicates the accuracy of the author and is a guarantee that the book fits the title.

Father Heuser's old pupils in St. Charles' Seminary at Overbrook, when he was professor of liturgy, remember most gratefully how he lightened their burdens by his excellent summaries of the text

of De Herdt. The same clear, practical method has been followed in the book before us, and the result is a small volume, very compact in form, without sacrificing anything required in the way of good type and good paper.

There is a demand for such a book. We all remember how we went forth from the Seminary well equipped in theory and armed at every point with volumes full of opinions and references and disputes, regarding non-essentials, of course. And then we can remember without much effort how slowly and painfully we learned how to do things in practice. Before long we began to realize that there is a best way and an approved way of doing each thing which may be safely followed, without bothering about conflicting opinions, and we wondered why some one didn't tell us that long ago.

Now this is exactly what Father Heuser does. He sets before us in the briefest, clearest form the best approved way of administering the sacraments. We are glad to learn that the editor proposes to bring out a series of volumes similar to this one—perhaps ten books or more—covering in an elementary way the field of practical theology. These books will have different authors, and the following titles have been already announced: "The Ordo and the Mass," "Priestly Etiquette," "The Priest's Library," "Spiritual Direction" and "The Church and Its Belongings." The last named will appear next.

We recommend Father Heuser's book to all priests, but especially to students of theology and to those who have been recently ordained.

CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF FATHER FABER. Arranged by the Rev. John Fitzpatrick, O. M. I., author of "Eucharistic Elevation," "Virgo Prædicanda," etc. 12mo., pp. ix.-626. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

All admirers of Father Faber will be glad to see this selection of characteristic passages from their favorite author, whose works on the spiritual life enjoy a world-wide reputation. For such persons this book will serve to recall the most beautiful thoughts and most striking passages of his eight great treatises from which the selections have been made. Those who are not familiar with the author will find in this volume a most fitting introduction to the wonderful treasury of spiritual riches contained in his works. The make-up of the book is thus set forth by the author:

"Two hundred and twenty-four selections have been made, of an average length of about two pages and a half—most of them neither very long nor very short—that is to say, one out of every five or six pages of the works that have been dealt with; and these have

been grouped together in four books. The first book, under the approximative title, 'From Bethlehem to Calvary,' treats of the life of our Blessed Lord, and is made up for the most part of passages from 'Bethlehem,' 'The Foot of the Cross' and 'The Precious Blood.' The second book—mainly from 'The Blessed Sacrament'—sets forth that continuation and extension of the Incarnation which, in the Holy Eucharist, makes our Divine Redeemer our contemporary and our compatriot; and this is called 'The Gospel of the Eucharist.' The third book, which is rather more than half the volume, is entitled 'The Warfare of the Christian Life'—thus indicating clearly enough the character of its contents—and is composed of extracts from 'The Creator and the Creature,' 'All for Jesus,' 'Spiritual Conference,' and 'Growth in Holiness.' The fourth book—not, notably, from any volume in particular—deals with the four (or five) last things, and has for title 'The Thought of the Eternal Years.' "

It will be seen at a glance that the plan is well conceived, and it has been successfully carried out. The volume completes the trio, the other two members of which are "The Characteristics of Newman" and "The Characteristics of Manning," and it is worthy of a place beside them.

IRISH AMERICAN HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. By *Very Rev. John Canon O'Hanlon, M. R. I. A.* Quarto, pp. 765. Illustrated. Dublin: Sealy, Byers & Walker.

This is a remarkable work for a man of eighty years and more who has always been engaged with the busy duties of a missionary priest in the United States and Ireland and yet has found time to build up in a truly historical manner and the best literary style this extensive volume. It is more remarkable because it has been done while the writer lived thousands of miles from the scene of action, and most remarkable because he was at the same time engaged on another monumental work, the lives of the Irish saints, in twelve large octavo volumes.

The reader of the work before us would not suspect this from an inspection and perusal of the book. There is about it no indication of failing power on the part of the author, nor any evidence of hasty or imperfect preparation. On the contrary, we find everywhere evidences of the vigorous mind, facile pen and capacity for research of a young enthusiastic historian.

The author's purpose is to set before the people of Ireland a general and complete history of the United States, showing the leading events from the beginning until the close of the nineteenth century in a summary but consecutive manner. It is most becoming that an Irishman should write a history of this country to which a stream of Irish emigrants has steadily flowed from early colonial

days. These and their descendants have ever been active in the upbuilding of the country and in its defense, and their names should be written with honor on every page of its history. This has not always been done, and there are many unaccountable omissions to record race and ancestry in making the scroll. This defect Canon O'Hanlon hopes to have remedied in his history. He has gathered together a great mass of historical material, digested it and arranged it, until it has come forth on the pages of this book, interesting, instructive and true. Every statement is backed by authority and may be quoted without fear. Altogether the book is worthy of the subject and the author, and this is high praise.

WISSENSCHAFT DER SEELENLEITUNG. Eine Pastoraltheologie in vier Buechern. Von Dr. Cornelius Krieg, Professor an der Universitaet Freiburg i. Br. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, net \$2.80.

From the earliest ages of the Church the Christian direction of souls has been looked upon as an *art*, indeed, to speak with St. Gregory, as the *art of arts*: *Ars artium est regimen animarum*. To our own age has been reserved the task of raising this important art to the dignity of a science. We all know from experience how defective our training heretofore has been in this department; how many things of great moment we were left to learn at haphazard in the exercise of the ministry, often learning only on the old lines of *errando discitur* and *usus te plura docebit*. It was not to be expected that modern science would suffer this state of affairs to continue without making an effort to reform it. Spiritual direction has a solid scientific basis, founded in the immutability of God's law and in the moral unity of human nature. We extend a most hearty welcome, therefore, to the important work, the first volume of which we have perused with intense interest. Out of the full treasury of a well-equipped and well-disciplined mind, Dr. Krieg has brought forth new things and old. He has marshaled the scattered wisdom of Catholic saints and doctors into a solid phalanx, in which part answers to part and everything is found in its proper place. This first volume of 558 pages treats of The Science of Special Spiritual Direction. After laying down the fundamental principles of spiritual direction, he reviews the entire field of pastoral activity, guiding the priest through his daily work with consummate skill and with a special eye to the needs of modern times. His remarks on the social question and the attitude of the clergy towards labor unions are peculiarly relevant and helpful. His following three volumes will treat of "Catechetics," "Homiletics," and "Liturgy." We shall give a more extended notice of this excellent work when it shall appear in an English dress; we trust very soon.

LUTHER UND LUTHERTHUM in der ersten Entwicklung quellenmaessig dargestellt. Von P. Heinrich Denifle, O. P. Erster Band. Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim.

In this formidable volume of 860 pages Father Denifle delivers his first broadside against Luther and Lutherdom. We have read ere now that the Spouse of Christ can present the appearance of an army in battle array; but this book rather resembles a modern battleship, bristling with ponderous ordnance. It is hard to see what is left of Luther and his "theologians" at the end of this first encounter; nevertheless, the learned author speaks of a second, a third and even of a fourth book: and the veteran Dominican is already over sixty years old! The work has produced a tremendous sensation in Lutheran circles, not only because Denifle has unmasked the "great Reformer" in such merciless style, proving beyond cavil that he was a conscious liar and falsifier and of depraved morals, ignorant, moreover, of the first elements of Catholic theology, but chiefly because he shows up with unsparing hand the puerility and ignorance in all matters pertaining to theology of the most lauded of living expositors of Lutheranism, from Harnack, Kolde and Seeberg to the common rabble.

After paying his compliments to Luther's editors, Father Denifle plunges in *medias res* by dissecting Luther's diatribe against monastic vows, the lies and sophistries of which he tears to rags and tatters. At times his indignation grows really eloquent; but he generally maintains a scientific reserve, as of a surgeon directing a clinical operation. The second section of this first book is devoted to an investigation of the steps which led the heresiarch into the path of destruction, and the materials grew so abundantly under the author's hands that he was obliged to reserve a part for the following volume. The whole is a masterpiece of strong and dignified polemics; in comparison with it even Bossuet's immortal work must yield the palm.

HISTORY OF IRELAND, in three volumes. By Rev. E. A. D'Alton, C. C., with Preface by Most Rev. John Healy, D. D., Archbishop of Tuam. Vol. I., 8vo., pp. 460. From the Earliest Times to 1547. Dublin: Sealy, Byers & Walker.

We feel that we cannot better bring this work before our readers than in the words of the learned Archbishop of Tuam, who knows the subject and the author well and who speaks without bias:

"Some persons may be disposed to ask if there were real need of a new 'History of Ireland,' seeing that there are so many already in the hands of the public. Yet it is difficult, if not impossible, to find a really good history of our country—what might be fairly described as an all-around good history—full, accurate, well-written and impartial. If the Rev. Mr. D'Alton has not yet accom-

plished this task, he has certainly made a praiseworthy beginning. This is the first volume of what is intended to be a three volume work, giving a complete history of Ireland from its remotest origin down to our own time. It is an ambitious task which cannot be accomplished without much learning, courage and perseverance. This first volume gives evidence that the author possesses many of the most essential qualities of an historical writer. His style is easy and limpid; in description, as well as in narration, he is vivid and frequently picturesque; he possesses the critical faculty in a high degree, and holds the scales of historical justice with an even hand. Moreover, he is a painstaking writer in verifying his authorities; he has the great advantage of a good knowledge of the Gaelic tongue, which enables him to consult for himself the original sources of our earlier history, and he has not failed to utilize all the State papers and other official documents which the nineteenth century has produced in such profusion."

A NEW DISCOVERY OF A VAST COUNTRY IN AMERICA. By *Father Louis Hennepin*. Reprinted from the second London issue of 1698, with facsimiles of original title-pages, maps and illustrations, and the addition of Introduction Notes and Index by Reuben Gold Thwaites, Editor of "The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. In two volumes, square 8vo., pp. 710. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.

This book is another evidence of the rapid strides which we are making in historical study in this country. Taken in conjunction with "The Jesuit Relations," already published, and the "History of the Philippine Islands," now coming from the press, it is a striking proof that we are beginning to appreciate the history of our wonderful country.

Rev. Louis Hennepin was born in Belgium about 1640. He says of himself: "I was from infancy very fond of traveling." And again: "I always found in myself a strong inclination to retire from the world and regulate my life according to the rules of pure and severe virtue, and in compliance with this humor I entered into the Franciscan Order." Here are the two qualities which combined to form the exploring missionary.

In 1675 he arrived in Canada in company with Francois-Xavier de Laval-Montmorency, Bishop of the newly-established See of Quebec, and René Robert Cavalier, Sieur de la Salle, the great explorer. In this book Father Hennepin tells the story of the exploration of the Mississippi Valley, which was to connect Canada with the Gulf of Mexico by a chain of forts on the Great Lakes and rivers. It is an intensely interesting story, notwithstanding the disputes that have arisen concerning some of the claims of leadership.

The book is beautifully made and ably edited. It should have an enthusiastic reception.

FICTION FROM BENZIGER BROTHERS, NEW YORK:

HEARTS OF GOLD. By *I. Edhor*. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 234.

SAINT CUTHBERT'S. By *Rev. J. E. Copus, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 245.

CARROLL DARE. By *Mary T. Waggaman*. 12mo., pp. 161. Illustrated.

The work which Benziger Brothers are doing for Catholic fiction is deserving of the highest commendation. At a time when the trashy novel with its false views of life, its false standards of morality, its sneers at religion and its descriptions of all that is vile only sufficiently clad to escape suppression at the hands of the police, is daily becoming more popular, and is being more widely read, they are making great sacrifices to supply an antidote for this villainous poison. It is a hard fight and calls for much courage and great expenditure. Even those who should appreciate these efforts are not always responsive. But they will surely win in the end, because the right must prevail, and the victory will be so much more glorious because the battle was long and fierce.

The stories before us are good examples of what fiction should be. They show us the various conflicting elements of human nature which are constantly warring in every individual and in every community, but they also show us that vice should be shunned and virtue cultivated, and point out to us that every sin brings its punishment. Parents should place books like these in the hands of their children if they wish to save them from the ruinous trashy novels that are being printed by the hundred thousand, that flood the country like a vast inundation and that threaten to overwhelm the youthful mind of the day.

LENT AND HOLY WEEK. Chapters on Catholic Observance and Ritual. By *Herbert Thurston, S. J.* 12mo., pp. xi.-487, illustrated. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The author says:

"The volume which is here presented to the reader does not, I think, require any lengthy introduction. Its chief purpose is to supply a popular account of those external observances by which the season of paschal preparation is marked off from the rest of the ecclesiastical year. Although a devotional conception has not been excluded, the writer's principal object has been to touch upon points of historical and liturgical interest, points which often bring us into immediate relation with the practice of the early Christian centuries."

The purpose is surely set forth modestly enough, but those who are acquainted with Father Thurston and his methods know his great ability for work of this kind. In addition to the power to express his thoughts clearly, he has that rarer quality of being able to search for the truth untiringly and of recognizing it when he finds it. Some of the chapters of this book have appeared elsewhere, principally in the *Month*, but they are well worthy of reproduction in this more permanent form and in conjunction with others with which they form a consecutive whole.

LEHRBUCH DES KATHOLISCHEN KIRCHENRECHTS. Von Dr. J. B. Saegmüller, Professor der Theologie an der Universität Tübingen. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung. Price, \$4.00 net.

Though there may be a diversity of opinion as to the advisability of using the Latin language exclusively in expounding theological doctrine from the professor's chair, there ought, we think, to be no question as to the desirableness of issuing theological text books in the official language of the Church. This is particularly true in the case of books treating of Ecclesiastical Law, not only because they are of little or no interest to those who do not understand Latin, but also on account of the numerous technical phrases in which legal phraseology abounds, and which, to be intelligible, must be expressed in Latin. We should have much preferred, therefore, that Professor Saegmüller had not chosen to publish his text book in German. But, with this reservation, we can bestow unstinted praise on the book before us. The author, having thoroughly mastered his subject himself, presents it to students in an admirably clear, precise and methodical manner. His extensive historical studies enable him to throw a charm over a usually dry branch of ecclesiastical lore, by following up the development of the laws and institutions of the Church. An abundant index at the end greatly facilitates the use of the book.

READING AND THE MIND WITH SOMETHING TO READ. By Rev. J. F. X. O'Connor, S. J. Sixth Edition revised and enlarged. 12mo., pp. 209. Philadelphia: John J. McVey.

A book which has reached the eleventh thousand hardly needs an introduction, for it sounds its own praises in numbers. The public is to be congratulated for its appreciation of the work. Most readers need a guide, for all readers are not students in the full sense of the word. Nearly all men read, but few discriminate. This truth is illustrated by the records of our public libraries and by the account of sales in the leading book stores throughout the country. If we may judge by these records and by these accounts, and the conver-

sation of those about us concerning their reading seems to indicate that we may, a guide to reading is badly needed. Father O'Connor discharges the office well in the book before us. He may be safely and pleasantly followed.

EXCERPTA EX RITUALI ROMANO PRO ADMINISTRATIONE SACRAMENTORUM, ad Commodiorem Usum Missionariorum, in Septentrionalis Americae Federatae Provinciis. Novis curis novoque ordine disposita. Editio decima tertia. New York: Pustet & Co.

This is a very convenient, well arranged and well made pocket Ritual such as priests on the mission use principally when attending sick calls. It contains all that books like it usually contain, the sacraments, the sacramentals and the principal blessings of persons, places and things. We do not intend to condemn it in any way whatever, because it is excellent in every respect as such things go. We do believe, however, that a departure from the usual order so far as to bring all the matter for the sick room into one place would be welcomed by every priest. One or two typographical errors which are not at all misleading will no doubt be corrected in the first reprint.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- A BISHOP AND HIS FLOCK.** By *John Cuthbert Hedley, O. S. B.*, Bishop of Newport. 12mo., pp. viii.-414. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- ANECDOTES AND EXAMPLES**, illustrating the Catholic Catechism. Selected and arranged by Rev. Francis Spirago, Professor of Theology. Supplemented, Adapted and Edited by Rev. James J. Baxter, D. D., author of "Sermons From the Latins," etc. 8vo., pp. xxvii.-596. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- SPIRITUAL DESPONDENCY AND TEMPTATIONS.** By *Rev. P. J. Michel, S. J.* Translated from the French by Rev. F. P. Garesche, S. J. Revised and corrected. 12mo., pp. 278. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE PRIEST: HIS CHARACTER AND WORK.** By *James Keatinge*, Canon and Administrator of St. George's Cathedral, Southwark, and Diocesan Inspector of Schools. 12mo., pp. x.-323. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE SYMBOL OF THE APOSTLES.** A vindication of the Apostolic Authorship of the Creed on the Lines of Catholic Tradition. By the *Very Rev. Alexander MacDonald, D. D.*, Vicar General of the Diocese of Antigonish, Nova Scotia. 12mo., pp. 377. New York: Christian Press Association.
- WHERE BELIEVERS MAY DOUBT; or, Studies in Biblical Inspiration and Other Problems of Faith.** By *Vincent J. McNabb, O. P.* 8vo., pp. xi.-114. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- VIAJES EN ESPAÑA Y SUD-AMÉRICA.** Por el Presbitero *Kenelm Vaughan*. 8vo., pp. xxi.-346. New York: Christian Press Association.
- SHORT INSTRUCTION IN THE ART OF SINGING PLAIN CHANT.** By *J. Singenberger*, President of the American St. Cecilia Society. 16mo., pp. 97. New York: Pustet & Co.
- MANUAL OF CONFIRMATION.** Containing Instructions and Devotions for Confirmation Classes. By *P. J. Schmitt*. 8vo., pp. 206. New York: Joseph Schaefer.
- THE OBLIGATION OF HEARING MASS ON SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS.** By *Rev. J. T. Roche*. 12mo., pp. 71. Dubuque: The T. F. Phillips Co.
- COMPENDIUM SACRÆ LITURGIE IUXTA RITUM ROMANUM, Una cum Appendice de Iure Ecclesiastico Particulari in America Federata Sept. Viginti.** Scripsit *P. Innocentius Wapellhorst, O. F. M.* Editio Sexta. 8vo., pp. xvi.-601. Neo-Eboraci: Benziger Fratres.

